COLLECTED WORKS OF ERASMUS

VOLUME 46

This page intentionally left blank

COLLECTED WORKS OF ERASMUS

NEW TESTAMENT SCHOLARSHIP

General Editor Robert D. Sider

PARAPHRASE ON JOHN

translated and annotated by

Jane E. Phillips

University of Toronto Press

Toronto / Buffalo / London

The research and publication costs of the
Collected Works of Erasmus are supported by the
Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.
The publication costs are also assisted by
University of Toronto Press.
www.utppublishing.com

©University of Toronto Press 1991

Toronto / Buffalo / London
Printed in Canada

ISBN 0-8020-5859-0

Printed on acid-free paper

Canadian Cataloguing in Publication Data
Erasmus, Desiderius, d. 1536.
[Works]
Collected Works of Erasmus

Includes bibliographical references.
Partial contents: v. 46. New Testament scholarship:
Paraphrase on John / translated and annotated by
Jane E. Phillips.
ISBN 0-8020-5859-0 (v. 46)

1. Erasmus, Desiderius, d. 1536. I. Title.

PA8500 1974 876'.04 C74-006326-X

Collected Works of Erasmus

The aim of the Collected Works of Erasmus
is to make available an accurate, readable English text
of Erasmus' correspondence and his
other principal writings. The edition is planned
and directed by an Editorial Board, an Executive Committee,
and an Advisory Committee.

EDITORIAL BOARD

Alexander Dalzell, University of Toronto
James M. Estes, University of Toronto
Charles Fantazzi, University of Windsor
Anthony T. Grafton, Princeton University
Paul F. Grendler, University of Toronto
James K. McConica, University of Toronto, *Chairman*
Erika Rummel, University of Toronto, *Executive Assistant*
Robert D. Sider, Dickinson College
J.K. Sowards, Wichita State University
G.M. Story, Memorial University of Newfoundland
Craig R. Thompson, University of Pennsylvania

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Alexander Dalzell, University of Toronto
James M. Estes, University of Toronto
Charles Fantazzi, University of Windsor
Anthony T. Grafton, Princeton University
Paul F. Grendler, University of Toronto
James K. McConica, University of Toronto
George Meadows, University of Toronto Press
Ian Montagnes, University of Toronto Press
R.J. Schoeck, Universität Trier
R.M. Schoeffel, University of Toronto Press, *Chairman*
Robert D. Sider, Dickinson College
J.K. Sowards, Wichita State University
G.M. Story, Memorial University of Newfoundland
Craig R. Thompson, University of Pennsylvania
Prudence Tracy, University of Toronto Press

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Danilo Aguzzi-Barbagli, University of British Columbia
Maria Cytowska, University of Warsaw
O.B. Hardison jr, Georgetown University
Otto Herding, Universität Freiburg
Jozef IJsewijn, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven
Robert M. Kingdon, University of Wisconsin
Paul Oskar Kristeller, Columbia University
Maurice Lebel, Université Laval
Jean-Claude Margolin, Centre d'études supérieures de la Renaissance de Tours
Bruce M. Metzger, Princeton Theological Seminary
Clarence H. Miller, St Louis University
Heiko A. Oberman, University of Arizona
John Rowlands, British Library
J.S.G. Simmons, Oxford University
John Tedeschi, University of Wisconsin
J. Trapman, Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen
J.B. Trapp, Warburg Institute

NEW TESTAMENT SCHOLARSHIP COMMITTEE

J.J. Bateman, University of Illinois
H.J. de Jonge, Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden
J.K. McConica, University of Toronto
Bruce M. Metzger, Princeton Theological Seminary
Jaroslav Pelikan, Yale University
Robert D. Sider, Dickinson College, *Chairman*
Craig R. Thompson, University of Pennsylvania

Contents

Preface
by Robert D. Sider
ix

Translator's Note
by Jane E. Phillips
xi

Paraphrase on John / Paraphrasis in Joannem
translated and annotated by Jane E. Phillips
1

To the Pious Reader
226

Notes
229

The Sequence and Dates of the Publication of the Paraphrases
350

Works Frequently Cited
351

Short-Title Forms for Erasmus' Works
353

Index of Scriptural Passages Cited
357

Index of Greek and Latin Words Cited
365

General Index
367

This page intentionally left blank

Preface

The nature and scope of the series of volumes to be published as the New Testament scholarship of Erasmus have been described in the preface to volume 42. That volume also provided introductory studies on the origin and nature of the *Paraphrases*, their publication history, and sixteenth-century translations of the *Paraphrases* in English. Those essays should prove useful to readers of this volume. At a later date, a full introduction to the New Testament scholarship of Erasmus will appear in a volume prolegomenous to the series (CWE 41).

Erasmus evidently found the Gospel of John difficult to paraphrase. His success, however, can at least in part be measured by the sheer variety of its most compelling themes. Perhaps first and foremost we search for clues to Erasmus' theology in his *Paraphrases*. Certainly in the *Paraphrase on John* we should like to find a clarification of Erasmus' sometimes controversial views on the divine nature. He will not disappoint us, but we may well feel that theological questions arising from the nature of divine revelation occupy a more central place. Likewise, he apparently wishes to address the question of human response to the divine self-disclosure, to explore the psychology of belief, and to explain the rejection of Jesus by the Jews – revealing the root of spiritual blindness in wills perverted by greed and vainglory.

As exposition and exegesis the *Paraphrase on John* evokes interest at several levels. There are the colourful details that explain the narrative setting, like the explanation (attributed to Bede, as the notes show) of the double-dealing by which the money-changers in the temple made their profit. There are also decisive interpretations of critical passages: in the paraphrase on chapter 6 the flesh and blood of Christ are explicitly defined as the 'words' and the 'teaching' of the Lord. Tropological exegesis is less pervasive here than in the *Paraphrase on Mark* (CWE 49), but we find here as there some traditional commonplaces; for instance, a change of locale by Jesus and his disciples is made to represent prophetically the coming change in the focus of redemptive action from Jews to gentiles. More telling is the frequent representation of the disciples as timeless symbols of bishops and leaders in the church.

I may point finally to the fine sense of drama Erasmus brings to this exposition of the gospel narrative, in spite of his own perception of the intractability of the material. The resurrection becomes a dramatic reversal in which the splendour of Christ's glorified body is set in sharp contrast to the long humiliation of his mortal body. Erasmus exploits also the ironies inherent in the dialogues between the divine Christ and the worldly-wise religious savants who cannot recognize the man before them. Nor are the characters without drama. Few and paradigmatic as they are, they come before us as figures of our own world, where fear turns to envy, envy to malice. Even the crowd assumes an identity, as it panders spinelessly to the Pharisees.

This volume has been greatly enriched by Professor Phillips' assiduous search for the patristic and medieval sources of Erasmus' exposition. Her commentary also traces the course of the debates between Erasmus and his contemporaries prompted by the *Paraphrase on John*. Not least, the reader will appreciate those notes wherein we are shown the degree to which, in the process of paraphrasing, Erasmus follows – or disregards – the text of the Vulgate. At every point, the annotation has been designed to facilitate access to the mind of Erasmus.

RDS

Translator's Note

In February 1523 Erasmus published his *Paraphrase on the Gospel of John*. This paraphrase, apart from various authorized and unauthorized issues, appeared in three new editions during Erasmus' lifetime: in 1524, 1534, and 1535. The four editions all originated at the Froben press in Basel.[1] In keeping with the practice of the Collected Works of Erasmus, it is the 1535 text that is translated here. While in the case of some of his theological works new editions meant extensive additions and alterations to the text of the first editions, often in response to contemporary theological controversies or to criticisms of the earlier versions, Erasmus changed the text of the *Paraphrase on John* scarcely at all over the thirteen years from 1523 to 1535. Apart from the normal typographical corrections, what changes there are mostly clarify or correct the grammatical sense of the Latin or add some small detail to the content of a phrase or sentence. Such changes will be indicated in the notes where they occur.

When he came to paraphrase the Fourth Gospel, by late November 1522, Erasmus had already published paraphrases on all the Epistles, beginning with Romans in 1517, and his first Gospel paraphrase, Matthew, which appeared in March 1522. The entire paraphrasing project was intended to make the Gospels and Epistles more accessible to the general reader of Erasmus' day by repeating the content of the individual books in an expanded form and in a Latin that was easier to understand than the terse, idiosyncratic language of the Vulgate, so that the reader would find the meaning and application of the gospel message made plain.[2] Erasmus had undertaken the *Paraphrase on John*, as he says, at the urging of Albert of Brandenburg, archbishop of Mainz, John Fisher, bishop of Rochester, and others,[3] but even while the work was in progress he remarked that 'this Gospel contains more obscurities than the others, not only by reason of the sublime and heavenly themes of which it treats but also because the language is full of riddles which complicate the sense.'[4]

These two points, the difficulty of the subject-matter and the obscurity of the language, recur in the dedicatory letter to Archduke Ferdinand prefixed to the *Paraphrase on John*. The long central section of the letter is devoted to the topic of a prince's role in the promulgation of the gospel and to complimentary addresses to Ferdinand, but it begins and ends with observations on the Gospel of John itself that illuminate Erasmus' approach to his task. The difficulties of subject-matter, he says, are attested by the number of commentaries and interpretations, and arise from the Evangelist's intention to explicate the nature of God and humanity's association with it. The obscurity of language arises from the deliberately figurative manner of much of Christ's speech, from the implausibility of the dramatic time represented in the narrative, and from the Evangelist's intricately interwoven style of sentence construction, all qualities that must be exaggerated or destroyed in the process of paraphrasing. To Erasmus' way of thinking, the Evangelist is without a doubt the same person as the beloved disciple, and thus from his particularly intimate association with Jesus was particularly fitted to compose a Gospel whose main focus is the divine nature of Jesus, an element not stressed by the other evangelists and already at the time of this Gospel's composition denied by heretics of various sects. Erasmus says that his own exposition follows that of the most approved Doctors of the church, except when their disagreements or anti-heretical distortions have caused him to prefer one or none of them. He claims no authoritative standing, however, for his interpretation, and advises the reader that he makes use of allegory, popular though it has been as a mode of scriptural exegesis, only sparingly.[5]

In the notes to the translation I have attempted to indicate the basic outlines of Erasmus' language and thought as he paraphrased this Gospel. Biblical language, theme, and story, of course, are prominent, as they are also in the Gospel itself. Erasmus' familiarity with Scripture rests not only on his own direct reading of it, but also on his broad reading in patristic and medieval authors, whose own language had been profoundly influenced by that of the Bible, and on the scripturally based language of liturgy and daily office. The notes record biblical allusions and echoes where they have been introduced by Erasmus, not where he merely repeats allusions already present in the Gospel and identified in standard commentaries and concordances.[6] It is beyond the scope of these notes to assign scriptural echoes to one or another of the possible sources, except that notice is taken of instances where both Erasmus and the patristic or medieval commentators he is following allude to the same passages of Scripture in their treatment of the same places of the Gospel. One class of biblical allusions is noteworthy: Erasmus does not try to 'synopticize' this Gospel by wholesale incorporation of incidents from the other three; instead, he respects its individual character by bringing in occasional references to the other narratives in clearly indicated subordinate or comparative expressions, so that the reader is aware that the material at hand fits into a larger story without being distracted from the Johannine version. A notable example, rather untypical for its length, can be seen in the paraphrase on 1:51, and a more usual one in the paraphrase on 13:2. On the other hand, non-narrative material from the synoptics and the Epistles is frequently introduced into the texture of this paraphrase, as for instance in the paraphrases on 2:11, 5:16, or 12:27.

Direct and obvious echoes of classical Greek and Roman literature are rather few in the *Paraphrase on John*, certainly in comparison to other of Erasmus' writings on less specifically theological topics. The subject does not lend itself to much enrichment from pagan thought; nor does the Evangelist's treatment, consisting as it does of relatively little narrative material and relatively much theological debate and exposition. It is in fact in the narrative parts where turns of phrase reminiscent of a Virgil or a Horace are somewhat more likely to appear. Cicero, Plato, Aristotle, Livy, Pliny, Suetonius, and other standard authors all have contributions to make, though small ones. The more pervasive classical influence, here as everywhere in Erasmus, is the rhetorical training provided him by Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian, from which he got the linguistic and stylistic tools for the task of paraphrasing – tools that he himself calls, in a work devoted to that subject, *copia*, or the double abundance of expression and subject-matter.[7]

Erasmus comments in the dedicatory letter on the attention the Fourth Gospel had received from expositors and commentators since antiquity. In his annotations on this Gospel he cites a host of names and works covering the history of scriptural scholarship to his own time. But he has some clear favourites; and comparison of their works with the *Paraphrase on John* shows that he keeps a steady though not uncritical eye on them. These are above all the 88 *Homilies on the Gospel of John (Homiliae LXXXVIII in Joannem)* of John Chrysostom (d 407); and also the twelve-book *Commentary on the Gospel of John (Commentarium in evangelium Joannis)* by Cyril of Alexandria (d 444), the 124 *Tractates on the Gospel of John (Tractatus in evangelium Joannis)* by Augustine of Hippo (d 430), and the *Enarration on the Gospel of John (Enarratio in evangelium Joannis)* by the eleventh-century Greek epitomator of Chrysostom, Theophylact the Bulgarian.[8] All of these are complete running commentaries or sermon series that cover the entire Gospel.[9] A work that must be presumed to have had an immediate influence on Erasmus' thinking in preparing the *Paraphrase on John*, though it is a theological monograph rather than a scriptural commentary, is *On the Trinity* (*De Trinitate*) by Hilary of Poitiers (d c 367). Simultaneously with the composition of the paraphrase Erasmus was preparing an edition of Hilary; the dedicatory letter for the edition, Ep 1334, is dated on the same day as that for the *Paraphrase on John* and discusses many of the theological issues that recur in the Gospel and the *Paraphrase*. Apart from these main sources, Erasmus also made regular use of the standard patristic reference works, such as Jerome's description of the sites of the Holy Land and list of the meanings of Hebrew names in the Bible, and in general drew on his long devotion to patristic literature as a chief resource for biblical study.

The great names of the patristic era were not the only ones to write running commentaries on Scripture. Indeed, Erasmus' first introduction to the Fathers of the church is likely to have been through the excerpts, compilations, and epitomes of their work in the form of the biblical commentaries that were the school texts of the medieval church: the compilation known as the *Glossa ordinaria* or *Gloss* (twelfth century), the collection of excerpts made by Thomas Aquinas (d 1274) and entitled *Catena aurea*, the commentary, heavily dependent for the Fourth Gospel on Chrysostom, by Hugh of St Cher (d 1263), and the *Postilla* of Nicholas of Lyra (d 1340). Though he objected to most of these works for many reasons – their fondness for allegory, their pettiness, their out-and-out mistakes, the naiveté of their interpretive principles – Erasmus was taught by them before he outgrew them, and their influence stayed with him.[10]

Citations of the patristic and medieval commentaries in the notes to this translation do not claim to be exhaustive, particularly in the numerous instances where the *Gloss*, Hugh, and Nicholas merely repeat Augustine or Chrysostom. Nor can these notes encompass a full treatment of the points on which there is disagreement among elements of the tradition Erasmus is using, or points in which he differs from all his earlier authorities, though particularly striking instances will be noted. The notes cite only positive parallels in some or all of the traditional material. Erasmus' selection of certain kinds of exegesis in the tradition and his avoidance of other kinds is a subject that would repay further study.

Erasmus' own earlier work also provided him with materials, analogues, and parallels to the words and ideas he employed in paraphrasing. To a great extent his *Annotations* on the Vulgate New Testament give the specifics of his scholarly views on the text and its interpretation. The *Annotations*, which presented philological arguments for corrections and improvements in the Vulgate text, were first published with his own Latin version and the first printed Greek text of the New Testament in 1516. They were reprinted in successively enlarged editions in 1519, 1522, 1527, and 1535. Erasmus' theological and pastoral views emerge more clearly from the

Paraphrases themselves, but they rest on the scholarship of the *Annotations*.[11] Since there are few substantive changes in the text of the *Paraphrase on John* after the first edition, while there are many in the printing history of the *Annotations*, the text of the *Annotations* referred to in the notes in this volume is that of 1522, the edition closest to the composition of this paraphrase. The notes point out where the text Erasmus is paraphrasing diverges from the Vulgate according to observations he had made in the *Annotations*, and where he accommodates the paraphrase to a Vulgate text he had rejected in the *Annotations*.

Many of Erasmus' other works also have their echoes here, notably the *Enchiridion* (CWE 66), the *Ratio verae theologiae*, the *Colloquia* (CWE 39 and 40), the *Moriae encomium* (CWE 27), but perhaps most of all the *Adagia* (CWE 30–6); popular and proverbial sayings would be especially fitting in a work designed for popular appeal. The *Paraphrases* themselves became the cause of other works by Erasmus, as he defended himself against the criticisms of the theologians, particularly those in Paris whose spokesman was Noël Béda.[12] But though church conservatives found much to displease them, and Erasmus answered them at length, very little of the controversies made any impact on the text of the *Paraphrase on John*. The notes point out the passages that provoked negative reactions and indicate the responses Erasmus made.

The translation and notes use the chapter and verse numeration, and for proper names the spelling conventions, of the Revised Standard Version of the Bible. The edition of Eberhard Nestle, Erwin Nestle, Kurt Aland, Matthew Black, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce M. Metzger, and Allen Wikgren, 26th edition (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft 1979) serves as a standard modern text of the Greek New Testament. For the Vulgate the third edition of the text edited by Robertus Weber, Bonifatius Fischer, H.I. Frede, Iohannes Gribomont, H.F.D. Sparks, and W. Thiele (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft 1983) has been taken as the standard. References in the notes to 'the contemporary Vulgate' mean that version of the Vulgate text quoted by Erasmus in his *Annotations*; this 'version' has not yet been identified with any single known text, but seems to represent something with enough currency for Erasmus to have commented on it. For description and discussion of long-standing issues in the text and interpretation of this Gospel that have had a bearing on Erasmus' treatment in the *Paraphrase on John*, a modern standard commentary is useful; the one chosen for reference here is Raymond E. Brown ed and trans *The Gospel according to John* The Anchor Bible 29 and 29A (Garden City, NY: Doubleday 1966–70).

My aim in translating has been to reproduce Erasmus' tone, emphasis, and metaphor as far as English allows. A long Latin sentence is usually broken into a series of shorter English ones for the sake of imitating the clarity of the Latin original. Paragraphing has been added and modern punctuation conventions observed. In the text and in the notes, where quotations are made from Erasmus' writings that have already appeared in CWE, the CWE translations are used; all other translations, from Erasmus, Scripture, classical authors, patristic and medieval commentators, or any other source, are mine.

The Collected Works of Erasmus is indebted for its continuance to the support of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. I wish to add my particular thanks to the CWE collaborators and staff, the Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies in Victoria University, Kelly Library in the University of St Michael's College, and the Library of the Pontifical Institute for Mediaeval Studies, all at the University of Toronto, for their generous extension of privileges and fellowship during the completion of this volume.

JEP

PARAPHRASE ON JOHN

Paraphrasis in Joannem

DEDICATORY LETTER

TO THE MOST ILLUSTRIOUS PRINCE FERDINAND, ARCHDUKE OF AUSTRIA, BROTHER TO THE EMPEROR CHARLES, FROM ERASMUS OF ROTTERDAM, GREETING[1]

When I undertook last year to make a paraphrase on St Matthew's Gospel,[2] most honourable Prince Ferdinand, it was more on the authority of his Eminence Matthew, cardinal of Sion,[3] than from any resolve of my own, partly because the very grandeur of the work inspired a certain awe that deterred my mind from approaching it, and partly because I was in any case fully conscious of my own inadequacy, and there were many difficulties of different kinds to dissuade me from the attempt. I then thought that in this class of composition I had done all I ever should. And yet, I know not how, the success of my earlier rash venture and the authority of great men,[4] whose wishes it would be most discourteous in me not to comply with and whose commands it would be wicked to disobey, have brought me once again to the point of writing an exposition of the same sort on St John. I was aware that his grand theme is even more majestic, being mainly concerned as it is with the exposition of those hidden mysteries of the divine nature and its marvellous association with our own. What human intellect can even begin to encompass how God the Father without beginning and without end eternally begets God the Son? – into whom in the act of generation he pours the whole of himself, and yet loses nothing; and the Son is born from him, yet never leaves the Father who brings him into life? Or again, how the Holy Spirit proceeds from them both in such a way that there is a perfect community of the same nature between them all, with no confusion between the individuality of the three Persons? Who can embrace in his understanding the bond by which that supreme and ineffable nature bound man unto itself, so that the same Person who had eternally been very God of very God was born very man of man?

In expounding subjects of this kind, in which sometimes the alteration of a word might be an offence beyond expiation, what freedom can there be for paraphrase? Besides which, I saw that my journey would lie through country thickly beset with constant difficulties of every kind, interrupted by precipices, impassable with forest and with bogs, and barred by floods and whirlpools. No Gospel has given rise to more numerous or more difficult problems concerning the faith, none has been the object of more intense efforts by the greatest intellects of antiquity, none has seen greater disagreement among its interpreters, and this I ascribe not to their stupidity or lack of experience, but either to the obscurity of the language or to the difficulty of the subject-matter. And there were those further problems in which this activity is specially involved: almost all of the language which the Evangelist puts into the mouth of the Lord Jesus is highly figurative and obscure. If one makes these figures clear in the paraphrase, there is no connection with the answers given to him by men who had failed to understand what he said. For the way in which our Lord says many things shows that he knew they could not be understood, and did not wish them to be understood,[5] until the course of events should make his meaning plain.

And again, while it is the paraphrast's business to set forth at greater length what has been expressed concisely, it was equally impossible for me to observe the limits of time. Our Lord is said to have celebrated the Last Supper by night with his disciples, and while they were at dinner he washed their feet; yet after supper he held that long discourse with them, until one wonders how there could have been time to say so much; especially since we know from the narrative of the other evangelists that much else was both said and done during the same night. This made it impossible for me to observe the limits of time, for I had to set out all these things at even greater length.

Last but not least, John has a style of his own; he strings his words together as though they were links in a chain, held together sometimes by a balance of contraries, sometimes by linking like with like, sometimes by repeating the same thing several times, so that these elegances of style cannot be reproduced in a paraphrase. For instance, 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.'[6] In these three phrases, 'Word' answers to 'Word' and 'God' to 'God'; and then he completes the circle by repeating his opening phrase, 'This was in the beginning with God.'[7] And again, 'All things were made by him, and without him was nothing made. What was made in him was life, and the life was the light of men; and the light shines in darkness, and the darkness has not understood it.'[8] In these it is clear that each limb of the sentence always picks up what preceded it, in such a way that the end of what precedes is the beginning of what follows, and one can recognize in this something like the effect aimed at in the figure called *echo* in Greek. On all these questions I have said something in my introductions.[9] This particular elegance in the expression I could see that I should often have to jettison in a paraphrase.

Thus it came about that, although I foresaw these difficulties and many others like them, nonetheless I set about this task, for so many great men urged me to undertake it by their encouragement or set me to it by their authority; and I was particularly encouraged by the success of the previous attempt, which was prompted by compliance rather than self-confidence. Nor was its success limited to the gratitude I received universally from fair-minded readers for the service I had done them. My work was acceptable to Charles, of all the emperors whom the world has known in the last eight hundred years the greatest, if one looks at the breadth of his dominions, and the best, if one considers his other truly imperial virtues, and especially his zeal for religion and piety; and that he found these efforts of mine most acceptable (for I had dedicated them to him) he showed not merely by his expression and by what he said, but in a letter which he wrote to me which was as complimentary as it was gracious.[10]

And so I thought it appropriate that, just as St Matthew had been dedicated to Charles, so St John should be dedicated to Ferdinand as Charles over again. Indeed, I flatter myself with the hope that this attempt will achieve the same success with Ferdinand as its patron that the other achieved under the emperor Charles. Two names in this age of ours are supremely fortunate, and one pair of brothers in our time are pre-eminent in promise, nor need we doubt, I think, that the virtuous desires of truly religious princes are brought by the favour of God to good effect. For I believe we can safely foresee a great future for those in whom, while they are still young men, a noble crop of virtues answers to the splendid hopes encouraged by the seed-time of their early years. Your spirit even in boyhood was something new and excellent, and displayed already the kindling sparks of such wisdom and temperance and gentleness, and such a sense of honour, and such religion and piety, that everyone was confident we should have an exceptional prince and one perfect at all points.

And if hitherto you have not betrayed the confidence placed in you by the whole world, you now do something more: you make us believe that, now you are grown up, you will fully satisfy what are no longer merely the hopes but the prayers of us all. My book on the Christian prince,[11] such as it is, you commended to all who care for such things long ago, while you were yet a youth, by being so good as to read it.[12] And now this book, which is expressly dedicated to you, you must be so good as to recommend, now that you are a young man, the most successful of our age and for many reasons the most universally popular. And the purpose is not that it may bring you any credit or me some advantage, for your exalted position and your natural modesty alike neither need nor wish for praise from ordinary men, and my own spirit seeks nothing but Christ's approval, but rather that it may bear more abundant fruit for those on whose behalf these efforts were expended –

and they were spent for the common good of all men. For things good in themselves bring in great profit only when the moment comes that they have conquered envy and achieved popular approval. To this it will be an important contribution, if you make it clear that the gift of this work of mine was not unwelcome.

For there is no fear, I imagine, that someone of your wisdom will give a hearing to the people who will say perhaps, when they see a Gospel paraphrase dedicated to a Prince Ferdinand, 'What business has a lay prince, what business has a young man, with the gospel?', and will take me to task in the words of the old Greek proverb about serving wine to the frogs.[13] As though the only men who give princes the right presents are the authors who offer them books in some barbaric language on hunting and the management of kennels, on the care of horses, on siege-engines, or perhaps on games of chance.[14] My own opinion is the opposite: that the philosophy of the gospel, fruitful as it is above everything for all men of high or low degree or of the middle sort, is more needed by the world's most powerful monarchs than by anyone. The greater the mass of business they must carry, the more fraught with peril the tempest of affairs which they must control, the more the opportunities offered them such as can often corrupt upright, well-born, well-educated natures, the more carefully ought they to be equipped and armed beforehand with the purest and most unfailing principles of gospel teaching; for if they go wrong, it is the whole world that suffers. Bishops have a special duty to feed the people from the abundant stores of gospel wisdom, and are therefore spoken of as shepherds; I quite agree. But there is reason for the praise that Homer earns, even from men who win high praise among Christians, for calling a king the shepherd of the people.[15] How much more closely should this title fit a Christian prince! The prince does not teach the gospel, he sets an example of it; and he who sets an example teaches too. But how can he set an example of something he does not know? And how will he come to know it, unless he grows familiar by frequent and attentive reading, and by serious effort gives it deep root in his own heart?

Who needs to be persuaded more than they that there is a king in heaven who governs this world and whom nothing can escape, whose eye no man can evade, whose power no man can resist, and who will judge each man as he deserves – who needs this more than the sovereign princes, so powerful that they fear no man and can deceive all men at will; who if they do wrong are not merely free from the summons to any earthly tribunal but are actually praised for their misdeeds? In whose minds should the conviction be more firmly implanted that after this life, which even for kings cannot be relied on to last longer than a single day and for no man can last long, there follows a life which will never end, in which with no respect for persons or positions (except that those who have enjoyed more power than others here will have the heavier case to meet) each man will face the inescapable sentence of an incorruptible judge and reap the crop he has sown here, nor will anyone escape the alternative of receiving for his good deeds a crown of eternal blessedness or for his evil deeds being handed over to the eternal punishments of hell-fire? Who needs this conviction more than those who are tempted by prosperity all around them and by the approval of mankind to love the present and forget the future? Who need to be more deeply impressed for their own good by Christ's denunciation 'Woe to the rich and the powerful who have their reward in this world'[16] than those who have an unlimited supply of all the things that can weaken mortal resolution? Who should more properly have learned the lesson that each man's talent is lent him for the advantage of the Lord, who will call on all men to render their account,[17] and [that it] should be laid out with care than they who, because the Lord has given them power, have it in their hands to be a source of much good or much evil in the affairs of men? Who have more need of the sure conviction that men, however great and highly placed, can of themselves do nothing; that for all of them anything that can truly be called a blessing comes from Christ; that they must ask him for everything that can be asked for in a Christian's prayers, and ascribe to him alone the glory for all their achievements – who needs this more than those who, in return for advantages which Christ taught us to despise, receive the plaudits of the world as truly happy and who, because they enjoy some empty symbols of felicity, are admired and reverenced by the common throng of men almost like gods? Who ought to be more fully persuaded that brutality is hateful in the Lord's eyes, and that one wrong must not be compensated by another, that nothing is better than peace or more pleasing to God than mildness and clemency – who more than those who have so many temptations every day to violence and war and vengeance? Who should have more deeply impressed upon their minds that neither desire of life nor fear of death ought to deflect them from the path of duty and that no man ought to hope for the reward of his good deeds in this life, while in the world to come no man can fail of his deserts – who more than princes, whom so many temptations, so many violent commotions, and so many opportunities continually encourage to do wrong? Surely a spirit like theirs, on which depends the public happiness or misery of the world, ought to be fortified with serious and solid principles of philosophy, that it may be able, upright and unshaken, to withstand all the siege-engines that this world can bring against it.

But principles of this kind, which like the ballast in a ship do not allow the mind to be tossed to and fro by the waves of fortune and events, cannot be drawn from any better or more effective source than the study of the gospel. It may be that a secular prince, absorbed as he must be for the most part in grosser business and in his duty to defend the public peace, cannot always achieve the results which he clearly perceives to be the most just; but if he has once drunk deep of the gospel philosophy, it will do this for him at least, that so far as he can he will always strive for what is nearest to the commands of Christ and will be deflected as little as possible from his aim. This we wish we may find in all those who govern the affairs of men upon earth; but in you, Ferdinand, we are confident that we shall: we know that from your earliest years you were remarkably disposed to love the reading of the Gospels, for it was not your habit to while away the time while the priest was saying mass in muttering superstitious prayers or in frivolous conversation, as most great men usually do, but to open the gospel-book and reverently look to see what lesson was taught by the epistle or gospel for the day. And I do not doubt that increasing years have much developed the sample that you gave us in your boyhood; I have no ordinary hopes that we shall see great crowds of mortals everywhere follow your example. For while vice is an infection that spreads very easily to the multitude when it starts from men in high place, the example of virtue in the same way is very quick to find a welcome everywhere if it takes its rise from some distinguished source.

With what solemnity the teaching of the gospel was clothed in former times, the ceremonies handed down from antiquity which the church still observes will suffice to show. The text in use is beautifully decorated with gold and ivory and precious stones; it is scrupulously preserved among the sacred treasures, and not laid down or taken in hand without signs of reverence. Permission is asked from the priest to read it aloud; it is sanctified by perfuming with frankincense and oil of myrrh, with balsam and with spices; every brow, every bosom is signed with the sign of the cross; all bow their heads and ascribe glory to the Lord; all rise to their feet and stand to their full height, with bare head and attentive ear and downcast eye. At the name of Jesus, every time it occurs, every knee is bowed; then the book is carried round, held in deep reverence close to the bosom, that every man may show his adoration with a kiss, until at length it is reverently replaced among the sacred treasures. What is the message of these ceremonies, what else have they to teach us, except that to Christians nothing ought to be so important, so much beloved, so much respected as that heavenly philosophy which Christ himself delivered to us all, which for so many centuries has enjoyed world-wide acceptance, and alone can make us impregnable against this world and the prince of this world?

But think how rightly the Jews are criticized for empty superstition which does not put first things first,[18] when they treat the book of their law with such extraordinary veneration, laying clean linen cloths beneath it, falling down before it and worshipping it, not touching it except with hands that are ritually clean, while in their impiety they pay no attention to the chief lessons of that very law; for in just the same way we must take care not to be found as truly pagan in our neglect of the gospel as we are scrupulous in our ceremonious respect for it. What purpose is served by a text adorned with ivory and silver and gold, with silk and precious stones, if our way of life is defiled with the taint of vices which are execrated by the gospel, if our spirit lacks all the radiance of the gospel virtues? Of what use is it to press a volume close to the heart, if that heart is far removed from what the volume teaches, and what it condemns is sovereign in the heart? What does the fragrance of all this incense signify, if its teaching smells stale to us, while our way of life stinks like the grave? Of what use to bow the head before a gospel-book, if our lusts hold their head high and fight against its principles? What do we gain by rising from our seats and standing bareheaded, if our whole life is such as openly displays contempt for the lessons of the gospel? How can a man find the face to kiss a volume of the Gospels who is a slave to lust and avarice, to ambition and gluttony and anger, and who treats its commands like dirt? How can he put to his lips a book which teaches nothing but peace, mildness, and charity when he despises Christ's teaching and is all corrupted with envy, besotted with hatred, aflame with anger, and swept by an accelerating passion for revenge into mad rage against his neighbour, giving full rein to his appetites and plunging the world into the raging confusion of war? How dare a man embrace and venerate the gospel-volume, whose every motive allies him to this world and who is execrated as an enemy by the philosophy of that same gospel?

Can we handle the gospel-volume with clean hands and as godly men should, and yet with unclean hearts despise the precepts of the gospel? It is these, surely, that we should clasp to our bosoms, these that we should spiritually put to our lips, and before these that we should bow our heads. Some people even have part of St John's Gospel copied out and wear it hanging round their necks to shield them from sickness or unhappy accidents of other kinds.[19] Surely it is the teaching of that Gospel that we ought to wear next our hearts to be our shield against all the sickness of sin. I do not disapprove of ceremonies or criticize the religion of simple folk. But such things will never do us any good unless and until we carry out in practice what we are called upon to do by these visible signs. If we are true Christians, which means that we profess the gospel teaching as its law directs, let us take all these external symbols and make them real in our hearts.

I hear there is a custom among certain peoples that the prince should stand for the reading of the gospel holding in his hand a naked sword, and all the others with their hands on their sword-hilts. But how can a man use his sword to defend the gospel whose spirit is an enemy of the gospel, who breathes the spirit of the world entirely, who despises nothing so much as that pearl of great price which is the gospel and hates nothing so much as the one thing which Christ taught us to seek, who preys upon his people, who oppresses the poor, who confounds all things human and divine by going to war, who provides so many evils with a starting-point and to glut his ambition sheds so much human blood? How can he brandish the sword in defence of the gospel of Christ? Let him first make his own peace with the gospel, let him first use the sword of the gospel to cut back the evil desires in his own heart, and then, if he likes, let him draw that sword to threaten the enemies of the gospel.

Give me leave to say this, illustrious Prince, to establish the facts, with no criticism of anyone. I simply exhibit the principle, and cast no slur on individuals; and this I write with all the greater freedom because not the slightest suspicion of these evils could touch a man of your high character. To no one after the bishops is the religion of the gospel more appropriate than it is to princes; but princes in their simplicity are often deceived by the semblance of religion. Sometimes they are persuaded by men whose credentials are the profession of a perfectly religious life, and suppose that perfect piety consists in the performance of a daily stint of what they call the hour-offices and in letting no day pass without hearing mass. In a prince who is a layman and a young man too this would, I admit, be some evidence of a religious disposition; but there are many other things more closely related to the duty of a Christian prince. If he looks ahead to forestall the storms of war before they rise, to prevent any violent assault on public liberty, to see that humble folk are not forced to go hungry and corrupt men not given office, in my opinion he will have offered God a more acceptable sacrifice than if for six years he has told those beads we hear so much of. Yet I commend this too, provided that what really matters goes with it.[20]

If however a prince were to suppose that he has met all the demands of true godliness because he can rely on the observance of such things as this, and were to neglect other things which are a proper part of his kingly office, this is a real canker in religion and a deadly sickness in the body politic, and those who make him think so are evil counsellors to both prince and people. It is a godly action to hear mass, provided one attends with a pure heart. But how can I approach with a pure heart the memorial of that true and supreme prince who gave his life for the salvation of his people, if my anger, my ambition, or my sloth bring misery or death to so many thousands of my fellow men? To say nothing for the moment of the fact that princes have scarcely any time of greater leisure and fewer anxieties than that which they reserve for divine service; and yet why is it so important that the prince should say those prayers at regular hours, when he can never find all the time he needs for the business of the commonwealth?

A prince will have uttered prayers in great plenty if he were to repeat every day, and repeat from the bottom of his heart, the prayer of that young king who was the wisest of mankind: 'Lord, grant me wisdom and understanding, that I may go in and out before thy people.'[21] Or one very close to that which the same king, if I am not mistaken, recites in what is called the Book of Wisdom: 'Give me Wisdom, that sitteth by thy throne, that she may be present with me and may labour with me, that I may know what is pleasing unto thee. For she knoweth and understandeth all things, and she shall lead me soberly in my doings, and preserve me in her power, and my works shall be acceptable, and I shall judge thy people righteously, and be worthy to sit in my father's seat. But thy counsel who shall know, except thou hast given wisdom, and hast sent thy Holy Spirit from the highest; and so the ways of them which live on the earth have been reformed, and men have been taught the things that are pleasing unto thee?'[22] And this wisdom, for which that very wise young man prays, may be found above all in the text of the Gospels, if a man searches for it wholeheartedly and with a pious desire to find. Otherwise how has it come to pass that the moral standard of Christians has partly sunk back into a way of life like that of gentiles but worse, and partly has degenerated into a kind of Judaism, unless this comes from neglect of the teaching of the gospel? Although, to speak openly, in no centuries have men been lacking to pay the gospel the honour that is its due; but all the same in these last four hundred years its energy in most hearts had grown cold.[23] All the more then must we use every effort to rekindle to the best of our power, each one of us, that spark of fire sent down to earth by our Lord Jesus, the eternal Truth; nor has he any other wish except that it be blown into a mighty flame, spread far and wide, and set all things on fire.

When the moral standards of the age are so much corrupted, and there are these great dissensions in men's thinking that now reduce all things to chaos, where can we better seek refuge than, as St Hilary rightly points out,[24] in the pure springs of Holy Scripture, of which the Gospels are the purest and most unsullied part? Rulers ought not to suspect the gospel on the ground that, as certain persons idly cry, it spreads subversion among those whose duty it is to be obedient to princes. Not at all: what it does for princes is to make them princes true to the name instead of tyrants, and what it does for the people is to make them more willing to obey a good prince and more patient in bearing one they do not like. And in the end of all it should not be considered the fault of the gospel if someone makes a less than admirable use of something admirable in itself. It is called the gospel of peace,[25] first as reconciling us to God and secondly as uniting us among ourselves in mutual concord. The man who stumbles over this stone has only himself to thank and not the gospel. There is no human violence, no cunning, no massing of forces that can suppress the gospel truth, which shows its power most clearly when it is most oppressed.

But on all this I fear I have already said more than enough. So, after a few words on the author's purpose to increase the profit of reading him, I will make an end. When our Lord Jesus Christ's life and teaching had already been spread widely through the world by the preaching of the apostles and the writings of the other evangelists, John, well known as he whom Jesus loved, took in hand last of them all the writing of this Gospel, not so much to put together a gospel-history as to supply certain things that the other evangelists had passed over, since they seemed not unworthy of record. But the chief reason for his writing this Gospel is thought to be the desire to assert the divinity of Christ against the heresies which were already like evil tares sprouting up in the good crop; in particular those of the Cerinthians and the Ebionites,[26] who apart from other errors taught that Christ had been nothing more than a man and had not existed at all before he was born of Mary. It was however of the first importance that the world should know and believe that Christ was at once true God and true man. Of which the latter first makes a contribution towards arousing men's love towards him (for we are more ready to love things which we know) and then provides a keener incentive to imitate him. For who would try to emulate what had been done by an angel in appearance only and not also in truth?

Furthermore, seeing that the difficulty of what he tells us to do is matched by the splendour of the promises he makes us, it was right that his divine nature should not remain unknown, to give us confidence that he will beyond question be the defender of his own people, whom he so dearly loved, and that we can rely upon the promises of one whose lightest nod can accomplish whatever he wishes. But the earlier evangelists had scarcely touched on the divinity of the Lord Jesus. For this I take to be the wisdom of which Paul used to speak 'among them that are perfect,' while professing in front of everyone else 'not to know anything save Jesus Christ, and him crucified.'[27] Perhaps the time was not yet ripe for such an ineffable mystery to be made public in written form, for fear the godless might laugh to scorn what they could neither believe nor understand. Though in other ways too all the ancients are very reticent and use scrupulous language whenever they speak of what relates to the deity, while using greater freedom in what conduces more to living a godly life. Thus it was the foolhardiness of heretics that drove the apostle into more openly claiming divine nature for Christ,[28] just as the boldness of the Arians drove the orthodox Fathers to lay down some more definite principles on the same subject when they would have preferred to refrain from defining the kind of thing that far surpasses the capacity of the human mind and cannot be defined without great peril. And this province was rightly left for the blessed John, Jesus' beloved disciple; for seeing that he who is the fountain of all wisdom loved John above the rest, we may well believe that he inspired his favourite, if I may use the term, with a fuller knowledge of certain mysteries. Let us all therefore drink deep of this man whom Christ loved, that we in our turn may deserve to become lovers of Christ.

There is one point only to which I wish to draw the reader's attention. In this work I have followed the most approved Doctors of the church, but not indiscriminately or at all points, for they too sometimes disagree among themselves. But I always put forward in all honesty what seemed to me to be the true meaning, although I could clearly see that ancient authorities engaged in fighting the views of heretics distort the sense in places with some force. I should be sorry however if anyone were to assign to this paraphrase more authority than he would have assigned to a commentary, if I had written one; not but what a paraphrase too is a kind of commentary.[29] Allegorical interpretations, to which I find some of the ancients devoted so much space that it became a superstition, I have touched on sparingly, and never more than I thought would suffice. Farewell, most honoured Prince; with all your might strive for the glory of the gospel; and so may Christ the Almighty in return vouchsafe a favourable answer to your prayers.

Basel, 5 January 1523

PARAPHRASE ON THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO JOHN

Chapter 1

Since the nature of God immeasurably surpasses the feebleness of human intelligence, however talented and acute that intelligence may otherwise be, its reality cannot be perceived by our senses, or conceived by our mind, or represented by our imagination, or set out in words.[1] Yet even so traces of divine power, wisdom, and goodness cast a dim glow in the created universe. As a result parallels drawn from the things that we do in some fashion grasp with our senses and intelligence guide us towards a vague and shadowy knowledge of the incomprehensibles, so that somehow we gaze on them, as through a dream and mist.[2] But whether one considers the angels or the machinery of the heavens or these lower bodies (not so familiar to our senses that we can fully understand even them), no parallel can be drawn from any created thing that in all respects squares with the structure and nature of the things knowledge of which such comparisons are employed to provide. And so it is fitting for a human being to direct all the mind's zeal to loving the goodness of God rather than to looking upon or apprehending his sublimity, which not even cherubim or seraphim fully attain. And though God cannot but be wonderful in all his works, he has nonetheless preferred us to regard him as lovable for his goodness rather than awesome for his exaltedness. Further, in the coming age a fuller knowledge of the divine nature is reserved for those who have here purified the eyes of their heart[3] by the godliness of an unblemished life. No one knows the Father as he really is except the Son and anyone to whom the Son has chosen to reveal him.[4] And so to search out knowledge of the nature of God by human reasoning is recklessness; to speak of the things that cannot be set out in words is madness; to define them is sacrilege.[5] But if it is granted to behold any part of these things, simple faith grasps it more truly than do the resources of human wisdom.[6]

And in order to achieve eternal salvation it is enough for now to believe about God those things that he himself has openly made known about himself in Holy Scripture, through men chosen for this purpose and inspired by his Spirit; and the things that he himself, later dwelling on earth, revealed to his disciples; and finally, the things that he saw fit to disclose through the Holy Spirit to the same disciples, chosen for this purpose. To hold fast to these things in simple faith is the philosophy of Christ; to revere them in purity of heart is true religion; to strive through them towards preparation for the heavenly life is godliness; to be steadfast in them is victory; to be victorious by means of them is the height of bliss. On the other hand, for a human being to use human reasoning to pursue investigation of divine matters beyond these limits is a mark of a dangerous and wicked presumption.

Moreover, what the other evangelists have preached in spoken words deserving of trust and have published in written form was clearly sufficient,[7] for in describing in order the birth of Jesus Christ in the flesh, his life, and his death, they affirmed his true human nature; and in repeating his words and recording his miracles and his resurrection from the dead they also made known his divine nature in a way that suited those times, though they were silent on his divine birth, whereby in an indescribable fashion he is born from the Father without beginning, and they held back from the outright appellation of God.[8] Their reason was that while the truth would not be concealed from the godly and those willing to learn, no excuse would be given the weak and ignorant Jews for recoiling from the gospel teaching, for from the tradition of their forefathers and also from the sacred scrolls of Moses the Jews were thoroughly convinced that it was sinful to attribute the word 'God' to any except the one God whom they had always worshipped; and the other evangelists also wanted no opportunity to be given the gentiles for persisting in their profane error (for they worshipped countless gods, even human beings made into gods) if they should realize that in the Gospels too the name of God was common to more than one. For the ears of the Jews, incapable of this mystery because they thought the name could not be shared, would by no means have endured this at the beginning, and the hearts of the gentiles, steeped in the belief in many gods, could not immediately have been instructed that there were three Persons distinct in particularity each of whom was truly God and yet there was only one God because of the one divine nature equally shared among the three. But so it seemed best to God, in order for the gospel faith to be more firmly set, that it be imparted to the human race gradually, in proportion to the progress of the times and the capacity of humankind. So the nation of the Jews scrupulously worshipped God the Father for many generations, in ignorance of the Son and the Holy Spirit. And when the Son of God himself lived in a mortal body on earth and before our eyes felt hunger and thirst and drowsiness, grieved, wept, felt anger and pity, for a long time he bore with being considered even by his disciples nothing other than a man. In fact even after the resurrection he wished them to remain ignorant of some things. He did not reveal everything even through the Holy Spirit, but only those things that made for the persuasiveness of the gospel teaching and for the salvation of the human race.[9] For since the nature of divine things is incomprehensible to even the loftiest human or angelic minds, while the proclamation of the gospel concerns all mortals equally, the heavenly Father has disclosed to us through his Son only so much of divine matters as he has wished to be sufficient for salvation. And so it is a mark of a dangerous recklessness to assert anything about the nature of God beyond what Christ himself or the Holy Spirit has disclosed to us.

But in these times, as the wheat of the gospel word has grown in the hearts of the godly, so alongside it have grown up the weeds of the wicked,[10] whose damnable recklessness has broken out so far that some have not hesitated to take from Jesus Christ the nature of his human body, substituting for a real man the empty ghost and illusion of a man; others on the other hand subtract his divine nature, falsely claiming that he came into existence only at the time when he was born of the Virgin Mary, because blinded by earthly passions they do not follow the mystery of the divine purpose, how the true God took on himself true man, so that the same one was both things, and nothing was then withdrawn from his unchangeable divine nature, and the completeness of his human nature was intact.[11] For this reason we will set out some things more plainly in this Gospel, in so far as the spirit of Christ[12] has seen fit to reveal them to us and as he himself thought sufficient for the achievement of salvation through the gospel faith.

So then, as I started to say, in order to give some knowledge of things that are neither intelligible to anyone nor explicable by anyone, it is necessary to make use of[13] words for things familiar to our perception, although there is nothing anywhere in the created universe from which a comparison could be drawn that would square exactly with the reality of the divine nature. And so, just as the mysteries of Scripture call the highest mind,[14] than which nothing greater or better can be conceived,[15] God, likewise they call God's only Son the Word[16] of that mind.[17] For though a son is not the same as his father, yet in his likeness he reflects as it were his father, so that it is possible to see each one in the other, the father in a son and the son in a father.[18] But the likeness of begetter and begotten, which in human begetting is imperfect in many ways, is utterly perfect in God the Father and his Son. And there is no other object that more fully and clearly expresses the invisible form of the mind than speech[19] that does not lie.

Speech is truly the mirror of the heart,[20] which cannot be seen with the body's eyes. But if we want the will of our heart to be known to someone, our wish is accomplished by nothing more surely or swiftly than by speech, which, delivered from the innermost secret parts of the mind by way of the hearer's ears, carries the heart of the speaker by an invisible energy into the heart of the hearer. And there is no other thing among mortals more effective for stirring up every movement of our hearts than speech. And if authority is also present, it is speech by which what we want done is summarily ordered. So the term 'Son' is used because, equal in all other respects to the one from whom he is born, he is distinguished by the particularity of his person alone. The term 'word' is used because through him God, who in his own nature cannot be understood by any reasoning, chose to become known to us; and he chose to become known for no other reason than that from knowledge of him we might attain eternal bliss. This is no birth in time, or word like a human word. There is nothing corporeal in God, nothing that is transient in the flow of time or fixed by the boundaries of space, nothing at all dependent on beginning, development, ageing, or any alteration. He exists entire and eternal in himself, and as he himself is, so is his Son, forever coming to birth from him, everlasting from everlasting, almighty from almighty, all-good from all-good; in short, God from God,[21] neither secondary nor subordinate to his begetter, eternal word of the eternal mind, whereby the Father forever speaks with himself as in mystic thought, even before the creation of this world, the Father known to no one except himself alone and the Son. There was never a time when he had not begotten for himself the Son, there was never a time when he had not brought forth for himself the all-powerful word. He had no need of the created universe, since nothing can be added to his bliss, but from his innate goodness he created all of this machinery of the world,[22] and in it the minds of angels, and the human race, midway, as it were, between the angels and the beasts,[23] so that from the wonders of creation and even from itself it might deduce the power, the holiness, and the goodness of its maker.[24] Further, just as, if there were an almighty king, whatever he ordered done would be done instantly, so the Father, truly almighty, created all things by means of his Son and word. And for this reason chiefly he first delivered his word, so that through it he might become known to us in speaking, as it were, and so that through it, having become known by means of our wonder at the beauty of the workings of the universe, he might wind his way into our affections.

Hence those who think that the word of God is secondary to him who produces it, as with us intention is prior to utterance, stray far from the truth, as do those who count the word of God, by which God the Father created all things, among created objects. But even more stupid is the mistake of those who think that the Son and word of God came into existence only at the time when he was physically born of the Virgin Mary. Every created thing has a beginning in time, but the Son of God was born twice, once from his Father before all time, or rather without time, true God from true God, and again in time marked off from eternity, of the Virgin Mary, true human from a human.[25] For it seemed best to God to bring forth his word to us a second time in this way, so that he could be known more nearly and dearly. Hence anyone who argues that Jesus Christ was nothing but a man is sinful, as is anyone who argues that he was created along with the rest of creation. The Father begot the one Son in two ways; he brought forth the one word in two ways: once in time, but forever outside all time.

For before this entirety of the earthly and heavenly universe was created, the everlasting word already existed with the everlasting Father, and this word came continually forth from the Father without ever departing from the Father.[26] He was of a nature undivided from the Father in such a way that he was with the Father in the particularity of his own person; and he was not attached to the Father as accident is attached to substance, but he was God from God, God in God, God with God, because of the nature of the divinity common to both. The two, equal in all things, were distinguished by nothing except the particularity of begetter and begotten, of utterer and utterance delivered. As he was the only-begotten Son of the only Father, so he was the one word from the one speaker. And although this word was God almighty *from* the almighty, nonetheless, distinguished by the particularity of his person, not by a difference in nature, he was *with* God the Father, not an emission in time[27] but before all time forever proceeding from his Father's mind without ever departing from it.[28] And he was not created by the Father;[29] but through this word of his, coeternal with himself, the Father created all things that were created,[30] visible and invisible;[31] through it he governs all things, through it he has renewed all things, not as using a tool or a servant,[32] but as using a son of the same nature and the same power, so that everything that exists comes from the Father as the ultimate source but through the Son, whom he had eternally begotten equal to himself in all things and whom he begets[33] without end.

And not only was there in this word of God the power of creating at his nod the entirety of things visible and invisible, but the life and vigour of all created things was also in him,[34] so that through him every single thing would live by its own innate vigour and would protect itself, once the force of life was implanted, by continual procreation. For there is nothing idle or inactive in the great throng of creatures. Every grass and tree has its own life force implanted in it; every breathing thing has its own quality of mind. But just as in his providence he equipped everything he created with an implanted life force for the activity particular to each and for the perpetuation of its kind, so also he did not leave the lovely workmanship of this world without light. In fact, as he is for all things the source of life so is he also the source of light, inasmuch as the Father through his eternal begetting pours into him the fullness of the divine nature, so that he alone restores life even to the dead, and with his light scatters the darkness of souls no matter how thick it may be. So what the sun is to physical things, the divine word, which is Christ Jesus, is to the minds of mortals,[35] to whom in indescribable love he longed to bring aid when by sin they had fallen into deepest darkness and death. For once humankind lived in ignorance, dwelling in the darkness of their sins, worshipping mute statues instead of the living God,[36] basely sunk in the blind lusts of their souls, and they did not have the eyes of the heart with which eternal reality is discerned. God had sprinkled in human hearts some tiny spark of percipient intelligence, but bodily passions and the darkness of sins had blinded it. And so great was the gloom of this world that neither human philosophy nor the religion of the Mosaic law nor the firebrands of the prophets[37] could dispel it. At last our eternal sun came, to whose unconquerable light every gloom gives way. And he came to restore life to all people,[38] not just to the Jews but to all the nations of the world, and once the gloom of sins had been wiped away, to give eyes to all to acknowledge through the light of faith God the Father, who alone is to be worshipped and loved, and his only Son, Jesus Christ. Our corporeal sun does not shine on everyone, for it has its regular alternations; but this light goes on shining by its own natural power even in the thickest darkness of the world, offering itself to all so that they may live again and see the path of eternal salvation, which is open to everyone through the gospel faith. And though the world, blinded by the filth of sin and the gloom of base lusts, is unwilling to look at this light, nonetheless it has proved impossible for the light to be stained by any darkness of this world, no matter how deep. For he alone was pure from every stain of sin, and he was nothing other than light everywhere pure and undiminished. For the darkness of this world fights constantly against the light, which the world hates as the revealer of its works, and it quenches or dims the rays of many, but against this living and eternal light it has not prevailed. Tumults have been raised by Jews, by philosophers and men of power, by those who have completely surrendered themselves to transitory things, but this light wins out; it still shines in the midst of the world's darkness, and it will always shine, sharing itself with anyone who only shows himself capable of enlightenment.

But what is to be done with those who knowingly and willingly repulse the offered light, who when they are summoned to the light deliberately shut their eyes so as not to see it? Certainly nothing was left undone by him, so that no one would be without his light. For he did not thrust himself suddenly before mortal eyes, lest he make them even more unseeing because of their unbelief. For who would have believed such a wonderful thing if God had not in many ways gradually prepared the minds of mankind for belief? And so, not content to have declared to mortals in the wonderful workmanship of the world[39] his omnipotence, his wisdom, his boundless goodness, and his unparalleled love for the human race, and not content to rehearse, so to speak, his coming in so many predictions of the prophets, so many images and signs of the old law, at last he sent a man more outstanding than all the prophets, whose name was John.[40] Though John earned first place in sanctity among those born up to his time, and for the honour of his more than prophetic gift was called God's messenger, he was still nothing other than a man, generously equipped indeed with very many gifts of God, but gifts of God's bestowal, not of God's nature once and for all shared with him.[41] Yet this man was chosen and sent by God so that in accordance with the prophecy that had earlier come about him,[42] he could offer testimony about the divine light that, concealed in a human body, was dwelling in the world – not that he who was God and who had been proclaimed by his Father's voice had any need of human testimony. But so that in every way he might wind his way into mortals' belief, he wanted John to be the forerunner of the light, as Lucifer, coming first, announces to the world the rising of the sun; and by his proclamation to prepare the hearts of mankind to receive the light that was soon to follow. But since sins prevent the heavenly light from being let in, John summoned people to repentance, crying out that the kingdom of heaven was at hand.[43] For the first step to the light is to hate one's darkness.[44]

What is more, because of the remarkable sanctity of his life[45] this John was of such great authority among the Jews that he was thought by many of them to be the Christ;[46] so much more was Christ willing to be commended for a time to the Jews by this man's witness, so that in a human fashion he might gradually creep into the hearts of humankind. In other circumstances it is the lesser who is commended by the witness of one greater.[47] But Isaiah had promised that when Christ came a great light would arise for those who dwelt in darkness and the shadow of death.[48] And so before Christ shone out in the miracles many supposed that John was the light promised by the prophet; but John was only the herald of the true light, not the light itself. Hence to suit the dispensation of the time Christ made use of the error of the Jews and the position John held to prepare the hearts of all for the gospel faith. John was indeed a light, that is, a burning and shining lamp, burning with devotion, shining in the sanctity of his life, but he was not the light that brings life to the whole world;[49] instead, the word of God, who is the subject of our present words,[50] was the true light, forever pouring forth from God the Father, the source of all light, from whom everything that shines in heaven and earth borrows its brightness. Any spark of intelligence, any knowledge of truth, any light of faith, whether among mankind or the angels,[51] comes from this source. Just as without the sun this world is blind, so without this light all things are in darkness. But with sin and detestable error reigning everywhere, the world was in shadow on every side. And in these shadows from time to time there would flash forth men outstanding in sanctity,[52] like tiny stars in the thickest gloom of night, and they would give some light, as through a mist, but only to the Jews or the neighbours of the Jews. But this true light gives light not just to one nation but to all people who come forth into the darkness of this world. The Jews tried to claim the light particularly for their own because it seemed to be promised particularly to them, since in the physical sense it arose from them and among them. But it had come to enlighten through the gospel faith the hearts of all the nations of the whole world. It does not shut out the Scythian, or the Jew, or the Spaniard, or the Goth, or the Briton;[53] not kings or slaves. So far as the light is concerned, it came to enlighten everyone. But if any are steadfast in their own darkness, it is the fault not of the light but of the one who perversely loves the darkness and shuns the light.[54] It shines for all, so that no one can pretend an excuse, since he willingly and knowingly perishes by his own fault, as if someone were to stumble at midday because he is unwilling to open his eyes.

The word of God has always been in the world – not that he who is immeasurable can be contained by any boundary of space, but he was in the world as the intelligence of the craftsman is in his handicraft, as the pilot is in that which he steers.[55] The light was even then shining in the world, somehow making plain through what had been marvellously created the divine might, wisdom, and goodness, and in this way even then he was speaking in some fashion to the human race. But a great many people who put their happiness in the visible things of this world (and for that the Lord Jesus rightly used to call them the world,[56] whereas he taught eternal matters) were blinded by earthly lusts and did not recognize their creator. So great was their darkness of mind that the world did not recognize the one who crafted the world, but they worshipped snakes, cattle, goats, leeks, and onions, in fact what is even more worthless than these, stones and logs,[57] despising the one from whom they had received whatever they were or whatever they possessed. Accustomed to darkness, they shunned the light, and blinded by sins, they embraced death instead of life. Indeed, when he showed himself to the world in more familiar guise, dwelling in a human body and living among mankind, he was not recognized by those who had dedicated themselves entirely to this world.

And it is not so surprising if gentiles, who worshipped idols and measured all things by advantages in this life, ignorant of the law and the prophets, did not recognize him living in human form. It is more to be wondered at that though he had come particularly to his own people, to whom a messiah had been promised in so many predictions of the prophets, for whom he had been foreshadowed in so many figures, by whom he had been awaited for so many generations, who saw him doing miracles and heard him teaching, he was still so ill-received by his own that those whom he had particularly come to save plotted his destruction in their maddened hearts, and devised death for a blameless man who was freely bringing life to wrongdoers.[58] Seeing they did not see, and hearing they did not hear, and understanding they did not understand,[59] for in their warped zeal for the law they rose against him whom the law promised. So by their evildoing it came about that the light which brought eternal life to believers was for them the occasion of greater blindness. But it was not possible for their perversity to become an obstacle to the salvation of believers. Instead, the blindness of the Jewish race opened the way to the gospel light for the gentiles.[60] Those who to that point were considered the people of God, who alone boasted of their worship of the true God, their reverence for the law, their descent from the patriarchs, and the promises of the divine covenant, turned away from the Son of God when he came. Thereupon, the Jews, as rebels from the gospel, were rightly disowned and the gospel grace found a new home among gentiles, so that, the world turned upside-down, those who earlier were swollen with pride in the false appearance of religion openly made their sinfulness known, rejecting the Son of him whom they worshipped as God; and those who previously, quite removed from true religion, worshipped beasts and logs as gods embraced gospel godliness by faith. And yet in these circumstances the gentiles were accepted into the salvation of the gospel without precluding entry for either the Jews or any nations whatsoever, if only they lay down their stubbornness and show themselves obedient to the faith that is the first and only door to eternal salvation.[61]

What is more, though a great many of the gentiles and Jews alike, who loved the world more than they loved God, turned away from the light, its coming was still not in vain. In the first place there was the revelation of the wretchedness of those who by their own fault deprived themselves of the great goods that were freely offered to them.[62] And no one could now be in doubt that it was by God's just judgment that they were left to eternal destruction. Next, it became much clearer, on the other hand, how notable was the kindliness of God's will [for those][63] who accepted the gospel word with a simple and ready faith. For the Son of God and God himself sent himself down to our lowliness just to raise us by faith to his own loftiness. He took upon himself the shame of our mortality just to make us sharers in his divine glory. He chose to be born bodily flesh of flesh just so that we might be reborn spiritually of God.[64] He came down to earth just to carry us up into heaven.[65] For their unbelief disdainful scribes and Pharisees were rejected, arrogant kings and men of power were rejected, philosophers swollen with pride were rejected. But admitted to this highest honour were the lowly, the humble, the unknown, the ignorant, slaves, barbarians, sinners, whom the world considers worthless; nothing is required of them except a sincere faith – not learning, not noble birth, not reverence for the law of Moses. But whatever persons, of whatever nation and whatever rank, accepted this word, to them in return he brought such honour that, once implanted in Christ by faith and baptism, and once having proclaimed his name, they themselves also became children of God, so that what Christ was by nature they became through adoption. Then what is higher than this glory, that those who before were children of the devil, heirs of hell, by faith alone became children of God, brothers of Jesus Christ, and heirs with him of the heavenly kingdom?[66]

In the flesh we were all born children of wrath, from the first parent of our race, Adam; but through the word of God we are released from our wretched kinship with the sinner, and in the spirit we are blissfully reborn of God through Jesus Christ. For God recognizes as his children not those who are born as children of Abraham through bodily seed or sexual desire[67] but precisely those who are born of God by faith. The first parent of the race, Adam, had begotten us in wretchedness. For he had begotten us to death and hell. And those who are born in the flesh are not all born with the same lot in life. For some are born to kingship and some to slavery. But the parent of the new begetting, Christ Jesus, begets all anew equally to the same honour, so that laying aside the slavery of sin, casting off the lowliness of the mortal state, they may become, through faith and grace, children of the living God.

And it is not surprising if a human being is somehow reshaped to share in the divine nature, when the divine word humbled himself for this reason, to put on our flesh, that is, a mortal body,[68] from a virgin, joining in himself two quite dissimilar things, God and human. What is frailer than human flesh, or more despised? What is mightier than God, or more sublime? Do not wonder that these could be joined; it is God who did it. And do not lack faith that humankind can become children of God when he so loved us that for our sake he chose to become a son of man. For he did not put on an imaginary body;[69] who would love an empty ghost or a deceiving illusion? But he truly put on a human body; that is, he put on the whole nature of a man, not even disdaining the part by which we are in bondage to death[70] and differ least of all from the race of dumb animals. And he did not put it on for a time, soon to lay aside what he had put on, but in order to confirm faith in his human nature, not put on in pretence, he dwelt on earth for a long while; he thirsted, he hungered, he was afflicted, he died; eyes saw him, ears heard him, hands touched him.[71] And so that this honour for the human race might be everlasting, he still dwells in us, divinity clothed in human flesh and, in flesh now glorified, sitting at the right hand of the Father almighty.[72] But he was not without his divine majesty during the time when he went on earth in his mortal body. For we who lived as friends with him are witnesses of both natures. We saw him hungry, thirsty, sleeping, weeping, afflicted, dying. We heard him speaking in a human voice; we touched him with our hands; and by every piece of evidence we found him truly a man. But we also saw his divine glory, clearly befitting[73] the only-begotten Son of God, such as was never shown to any of the angels, or to any of the prophets or to the patriarchs, but by it God the Father chose to honour his only Son. What is more, we saw this glory in the doing of miracles, in the utterance of heavenly teaching, in the vision on Mount Tabor, when he was transfigured before our eyes, when also his Father's voice, coming down from heaven, declared him his uniquely beloved Son,[74] just as his Father also at his baptism made his Son glorious by the same voice and by the sign of a dove,[75] and again, when he was asked by his Son before his death to glorify him with the glory that he had had before the creation of the world, he acknowledged his Son in a voice that came down from heaven: 'I have glorified you,' he said, 'and I shall glorify you.'[76] And finally we saw him in the resurrection, when just returned to life he showed us his body, which could be touched indeed but was subject to no ills, and when as we watched he was carried away into heaven.[77] And his glory did not flash forth to us only in these things, but his death itself also contained proofs of his divine power, when the veil of the temple was torn, the earth shook, the rocks shattered, the tombs opened, the dead came back to life, the sun was darkened and brought untimely night to the world, while he breathed out his life just after giving a loud cry, as if putting aside his life by his own will, not out of the failure of his strength.[78] In this wonderful death he so glorified his Father that the thief who was his companion in punishment and the centurion acknowledged him as the Son of God.[79] And although while he dwelt on earth carrying out the task of our salvation he preferred to show us a model of self-restraint, gentleness, and obedience rather than display his greatness, nonetheless everything he said, all his deeds, even his bearing and expression made clear that he was full of every divine endowment, full of eternal and inviolable truth. For though God imparts to other holy persons also generous endowments of his grace and truth, still he had poured out the whole flood of heavenly gifts on this one as on his only Son, so that there would be in one what was sufficient for all.[80] And such he appeared to us up to the time of his ascension.

Now we will trace how he first became known to the world, though earlier he was not thought to be other than a man even by his own brothers. For he chose to become known gradually, lest a thing so novel not find credence among mankind if it sprang up suddenly.[81] And indeed much had taken place already that could in some measure prepare the hearts of mortals for belief: the authority of the prophets; the foreshadowings of the law; the choir of angels at his birth; the devotion of the shepherds; the guiding star; the reverence of the Magi; King Herod, with all of Jerusalem, thrown into confusion at the appearance of a new king; the prophecies of Simeon and Anna; and finally, some things he had done beyond the limits of human nature, whose meaning his mother and Joseph wondered at between themselves.[82] Yet when the time drew near at which it had been eternally appointed for him openly to set to the task of preaching the kingdom of heaven, it seemed best, as we said, for the present that he be commended by John's testimony also – not that he needed the testimony of a man, but because it was useful in that way either to invite the belief of the Jews, every one of whom thought highly of John; or to prove the unbelief of the sinful, since they did not believe even John when he was giving testimony about Christ, though they otherwise attributed so much to John that they supposed he was the messiah promised in the predictions of the prophets to set the Israelite race free. So since John had by then gathered many disciples, was baptizing a great many people every day, and was flourishing at the peak of his authority among all, preaching that the kingdom of God was at hand,[83] while at the same time people's opinion of Jesus was rather poor, he openly before the throng insisted on and repeated what he had often testified about Christ. And in accordance with the prophecy of Isaiah, who had predicted that John would be the voice of one crying out in the wilderness, 'Prepare the way of the Lord,'[84] he cried out in a loud voice, not now privately among his own disciples but before the general throng that in great numbers streamed out to him every day for baptism and instruction[85] and that even then was present with hearts fixed on hearing definitely what so great a man thought of Jesus.

He said, 'This is the one about whom I have often told you before now. You mistakenly prefer me to him, though I said that there would be someone who came after me in age and in the time of his preaching, and who would be lower in the regard of the people. He is now ahead of me, and the one who seemed to be second now is turning out to be first. And no wonder, since even before now he was ahead of me in every endowment, though in people's judgment he seemed to be the lesser.[86] He is the well-spring of all truth and grace.[87] We, whom you admire so much, are nothing more than mere trickles. Indeed, the very thing that each of us has as his own small measure is drawn from the fullness of this one, from whom whatever concerns eternal salvation flows forth to all. Whatever power there was in the patriarchs, in the prophets, in Moses came from his well-spring. I am nothing other than the forerunner of the one who is now coming. He is truly both the herald and the author of gospel grace, which bestows true and eternal salvation on all through faith. To him we owe the very fact that we have been trained for godliness by the word of the prophets, that we have been kept from doing evil by the ordinance of the law, that we have received as it were a foreshadowing of true religion.[88] Now also through him a richer grace is offered to all, a grace that through the gospel faith freely forgives all sins and bestows eternal life on those who have earned death.[89] For Moses, whose authority is sacrosanct to you, is not to be compared to this one on any point. He was only the conveyer of the law, not the author, and he brought a law that was powerless, stern, and rigid, to be in signs and foreshadowings a prelude for the light of the gospel that would come later; to reveal sins rather than remove them, and to prepare for healing more truly than bring healing, to invite with its promises.[90] But now, instead of the harshness of the law, grace is displayed through Jesus Christ, who through the gospel faith freely forgives all the sins of everyone. Instead of foreshadowings the light of truth is displayed, of which he is not only the herald but also the author, since to him God the Father has given all power. And these are the mysteries of God the Father, these the secret purposes of the divine mind, whereby it seemed good to him to make God into a man, and to make mankind in a fashion into gods,[91] to mix the highest with the lowest and raise the lowest to the heights. He revealed these things fully to no one of the ancients, though he did sometimes reveal to them some flashes of his light through angels and dreams and visions. For no mortal, however great, has ever seen God as he really is, except obscurely. And though to a certain extent he disclosed some part of his mysteries to Moses, the patriarchs, and the prophets,[92] nonetheless this fullness of grace and truth was received by his only-begotten Son alone, who was made man and has come down to us in such a way that through his divine nature he is forever in the bosom of God the Father. Whatever concerned the attainment of eternal salvation, which was somehow indicated to others in part, in veiled terms, and as if in sleep, he has told us more bluntly and plainly, without veils.'[93]

Although John had often privately honoured Christ with this kind of testimony, at that time he openly made known what he was, fulfilling the duty of a perfect servant, who wanted neither to take over the glory of his Lord when the Jews offered it to him, nor to defraud his Lord of what was his, though he knew very well that doing so would bring him not only the loss of the authority he had possessed until now but also grave disfavour among the Jews, who had preferred to offer such an honour to John.[94] Even the circumstances of his birth had been well known among the Jews, since he was recommended by the nobility of his family, for he was the son of a priest, and he had invited the admiration of the common people by the novelty of his diet, by the camel hair, by the desert, by the baptizing, by the throng of disciples; while Christ at that time was still despised for the lowliness of his family and a life and dress in no way different from the people. So since the lowly Christ was not pleasing to the haughty Pharisees and since they began to be rather jealous of John for the very reason that he spoke well of Christ, they sent men of eminent authority from Jerusalem, priests and Levites, to ask him in the presence of the crowd who exactly he was, since the crowd's guesses about him varied greatly. For some were saying that he was Christ, the liberator of the Jewish race; others guessed that he was Elijah, who they thought had returned in fulfillment of the prophecy of Malachi, to be the forerunner of the coming messiah.[95] Very few thought well of Christ, because of the humble circumstances of his birth and life, although some had begun to be jealous. And the cunning of the Pharisees was even then working towards manipulating Christ to their own desires. They thought that they would be successful if he were to be accepted only on their authority. But if he taught things opposed to their inclinations and failings, they would rebuke him and take away[96] the authority among the people held by one whose teaching they felt was contrary to their best interests. Such is the foolish prudence of worldly wisdom;[97] but Christ, whose entire teaching is heavenly, did not choose to have any part of human authority mixed with his gospel teaching. Some even hoped that John, though he was not Christ, would still acknowledge such an honourable name when it was spontaneously offered to him.[98] Themselves slaves thoroughly in the clutches of glory-seeking, they knew that this plague ensnared even the holiest men; they were well aware how great the world's applause would be if John acknowledged the name of messiah, with which a good many of the Jews already spontaneously credited him. If he acknowledged it publicly, they had the means to shut out Christ, hated because of his lowliness; if he did not acknowledge it, they had a slander ready to hand. So in front of the people, on the authority of the priests and Pharisees, they questioned him, saying, 'Who are you?' For they had already begun to feel aggrieved at his authority and to be somewhat jealous of his glory.

Well aware that they were making this inquiry out of hatred of Christ, John did not immediately reveal his own opinion of Christ but rejected the false supposition about himself, which could be an obstacle to Christ's glory among the common people; and courageously scorning the glory of a false name he declared that he was not the messiah, as he seemed to many to be. And he did not deny that he was what in fact he was, ready to point out who was the one to whom the glory of the name 'messiah' was owed. In the one of these tacks lay the loss of his own reputation and in the other the danger of the Pharisees' ill will.[99] But the man of uncorrupted honesty disregarded both and openly declared that he was not the messiah promised by the predictions of the prophets and Moses' words, by no means denying that the messiah was already near but saying, 'I am not he.' He indicated that such an appellation was owed to another greater, who was nonetheless in their judgment more despised. Thus the spiteful diligence of the Pharisees served no other end than the strengthening of the gospel faith.

So, frustrated at this stand, they continued their inquiry: 'If you are not that which is above all, as many attribute to you, since you are appropriating a new authority beyond that of the scribes and Pharisees and are exciting the people to marvel at you, not without a loss in the public authority of the priests and Pharisees, you certainly must be someone very close to the messiah. Now, we read in the prophet Malachi that before the messiah comes, Elijah the Tishbite will come, who will restore all things.[100] So are you Elijah?' John said that he was not Elijah – not that he was not in some way Elijah, for in the spirit of Elijah he was the forerunner of Christ, but because he was not Elijah the Tishbite, snatched up into the air on a fiery chariot, who the prophet realized was being reserved to be the forerunner of the second coming of Jesus Christ.[101] They had read the prophecy but had not understood it, and they were not worthy to learn of this mystery because they were making their inquiry with a malicious purpose. Furthermore, they knew that Moses had promised that a prophet would arise from the Jewish people, whom he had bidden them to heed, and some knew that this prophet would be the messiah himself, and also several people were spreading it around that one of the ancient prophets had come back to life, and they supposed that John was he.[102] For all these reasons they asked whether he was the prophet promised by Moses, or some one anyway from among the prophets who was living again and reassuming that authority. He admitted frankly that he was nothing like what many people supposed.

But now, since the material for their investigation had run out and people's suspicions about John were exhausted, they urged him to declare who exactly he was himself; and so that he would not back off any longer, they urged him on the authority of the priests, so that at least out of fear of their power he would admit who he was. They said, 'We see that you are appropriating for yourself something above the Pharisees, priests, and scribes. We have completed our investigation, and yet we must take some answer back to those who sent us here. If the whole people with its variety of suppositions about you is mistaken, tell us yourself who you are; surely you know yourself. Who do you claim to be?'

Here, since John was speaking to experts in the law, he did not want to seem to be laying claim to what he was out of human rashness. So he taught them from the very prophecy of Isaiah, well known to the Pharisees, both that he was nothing other than the forerunner of Christ and that the Lord himself was already present, whom they ought to receive with pure hearts (but whom in fact they themselves, blinded by jealousy, self-seeking, and pride, were going to crucify). He said, 'I am not the messiah, or Elijah, or one of the prophets called back into this life, and yet I have not taken up this task on just my own authority, because many years ago I was destined for this function by God's authority. For I am he of whom Isaiah wrote, "The voice of one crying out in the wilderness, make straight the way of the Lord."[103] You see the wilderness, you hear the voice of one crying out. As for the rest, throw aside the lusts of the world and prepare[104] your hearts for his coming, so that he may come to you as your bringer of salvation. Moses foreshadowed him to you, the prophets predicted that someday he would come. I show him to you already at hand.'

Now those who had been sent to John belonged to the sect of the Pharisees. For at this time they excelled the others in expertise in the law, in their reputation for sanctity, and in authority. And they were not far from the gospel teaching, for they even believed in the immortality of the soul and that another life after this one awaited them.[105] But self-seeking, greed, and envy had corrupted their hearts. And yet human jealousy had not at that time flared up so much that they openly opposed Christ; but soon, when they realized that his teaching opposed their glory, profit, and authority, driven utterly into madness, they forced their own messiah, whom they had promised to the people according to the prophecies and in knowledge of whom they advertised themselves, to the cross. So pernicious a thing is the knowledge of Holy Scripture unless accompanied by a heart free and clear of earthly lusts. But divine providence, wiser than human intelligence, knows how to make use of the malice of the sinful for the salvation of the godly. This questioning by the Pharisees, so jealous and treacherous, strengthened our belief. So now, even more annoyed, and jealous not only of Christ, whom they had always despised, but also of John, whom they had thus far revered, they turned to slander. 'Why, then,' they said, 'do you take to yourself the right of baptizing the people if you are not Christ, who the prophecies teach will take away the sins of his people, or Elijah the forerunner of the messiah, or that notable prophet whom Moses promised, or any other among the prophets? Where do you get your authority to take away sins since you do not have it from heaven or by decree of the priests, whose authority you are lessening by new rituals?'

To this slander John replied gently[106] but in such a way as to acknowledge freely his own lowliness and the high rank of Christ. He said, 'My baptism is like my preaching. For as my preaching is not complete, but only prepares your hearts for the gospel philosophy, so my baptism, which is only of water, does not wash away the uncleanness of minds but in a kind of symbol of true baptism prepares the ignorant, so that once prepared by repentance for their former life they may be capable of the baptism by which the messiah through his Spirit will once and for all wash away all uncleanness from everyone who has believed in his heavenly teaching. And he is already not far away, but is now standing in this crowd of people, and he dwells in your midst as one among the people.[107] And he is either scorned by you or unknown to you because in the world's judgment he is lowly and obscure, not advertising himself by any parade of those things by which the devotees of the world value a person. He has not yet decided to reveal his power and greatness, but in reality he is far other than he seems. I, who in the popular view have seemed to be something great, am nothing compared to his loftiness. He is the very one of whom I said that he was inferior to me in popular opinion but preceded me in honour. I am not to be made equal to his honour, so far so that I myself think I am unworthy to carry out the duties of the lowest slave for him,[108] even to undo the fastenings of his shoes.'

John pronounced this full and splendid testimony about Christ to the Pharisees, priests, and Levites with a large crowd of people as witnesses, and in a well-known place, that is, in Bethabara,[109] which is not too far from Jerusalem on the other side of the Jordan, a place suited, because of the handy supply of water and the desert nearby, to the baptizer and herald of repentance; every day a great number of people from various parts of Judea streamed to it to be baptized.[110] For John both preached and baptized there. And thus far he gave his witness about Jesus, who was standing in the crowd, without either naming him or pointing him out, so as not to arouse the jealousy of the Pharisees against Jesus, but instead to kindle the hearts of the simple with longing to know him about whom so great a man had preached so splendidly. And now many of the people were eagerly asking who was the great one to whose honour John, considered in everyone's judgment a most excellent man, conceded so much. So on the next day Jesus came back to the same place, and did not this time stay back among the crowd but approached John himself separately, partly out of a sense of duty, to greet his relative, partly to acknowledge his baptizer, but most especially to offer him the opportunity to give evidence before the people about Christ even more clearly; and so that, being still unknown, he would not seem to be approaching John with the same intention as the rest, that is, to be baptized or instructed or to confess sins.[111] For the fact that he was baptized by John has been given as a model of humility. But so that no one would suppose that he had need of baptism or that there had been any spot in him that the waters of the Jordan could wash away, he separated himself from the crowd and approached John.

When John caught sight of Jesus coming toward him, warned by the Spirit what was to be done, he turned to the people and pointed Jesus out to them, so that once he was known by sight to them too they would become used to marvelling at and loving him, and would follow him rather than John, seek his baptism rather than John's. For the purity of a heart full of the Holy Spirit shone forth even in Jesus' very eyes and face; he revealed himself by his very bearing and carriage, just as much as, at the other end of the scale, a maddened soul overwhelmed by vice is betrayed by the very appearance of his body.[112] 'Look,' John said, 'here is he whom many of you saw me baptize, though the Jordan did not purify him but he rather sanctified the waters of the Jordan. For he alone of all is free from every stain of sin. For he is that purest lamb which God, according to the prophecy of Isaiah,[113] appointed as the sacrifice most pleasing to him, to be the expiation for the sins of the whole world,[114] which is defiled with every sort of flaw. He is the one foreshadowed by the lamb of Moses, the innocent blood of which made the children of Israel safe from the sword of the avenging angel; he himself is so innocent of any sin that he alone is fit to take away all the sins[115] of the whole world; he is so dear to God that only he can turn God's wrath into mercy; he is so gentle and so desirous of human salvation that he is ready to pay the penalty for the sins of all and to take our ills upon himself in order to bestow his benefits upon us.[116] He is the one of whom I said earlier more than once, as in a riddle, that one would come after me who, preceding me in honour and power, would leave me far behind, because, though in the human circumstances of his birth and the time of his preaching, yes, and even in authority he seemed secondary to me, nonetheless he was far superior to me in divine endowments. And yet not even I knew for certain ahead of time how great he is or what he is.[117]

'He is so great that I, whom you admire, am not in any way to be compared to him. He is the Lord and author of all salvation; I am nothing other than his servant and forerunner, and neither my baptism nor my preaching is anything other than a rehearsal for the heavenly teaching and heavenly power that he will bring to you. And I have been sent by God's command for nothing else than to preach repentance for former misdeeds, to announce that the kingdom of God is at hand,[118] and to wash you with water, so that when he came he would more easily become known to your hearts, already prepared by basic instruction of this sort, once he had been pointed out to me also by definite signs from the Father. He was living humbly and not distinguished among humankind by anything, mixed in with the throng like anyone at all of the people; he came to my baptism like one in bondage to sin. So I was not able by his physical appearance or by human reasoning to know for certain that he was the only Son of God and the lamb most pure that through faith would take away all the sins of the world, but by a remarkable sign from heaven I learned that he was the one to whom I had been appointed forerunner.'

John went on and openly disclosed to the crowd what this sign was. He said, 'When this very one, choosing to display a model of humility to the world, came for baptism in the midst of the crowd of sinners, the Father honoured him with a sign from heaven. For I myself saw the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove coming down to the top of his head and hovering over him. Before then I did not know definitely whose forerunner I was.[119] For the lowliness of his body concealed his heavenly loftiness. The time had not yet come when God wished him to become openly known to the people. So when I knew by the inspiration of the Father that the messiah was now here, so that there would be no mistaking the person and so that human reasoning would have no uncertainty, he at whose command I had undertaken the ministry of baptizing you with water instructed me by a definite sign, by the evidence of which I would recognize who it was who would baptize you with a powerful baptism, and who, being full of the Holy Spirit, would through the Spirit freely bestow on all those who trusted him remission of all their sins. For before Jesus came to me to be baptized, the heavenly Father had warned me in advance, "By this sure sign you will recognize my Son: among the many whom you will wash with water, know that the one over whom you see the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove descending and hovering is he who has the power to baptize with the Holy Spirit." For a human being washes with water; he alone by heavenly might takes away sins and bestows righteousness. It was this sign, as the Father had promised, that I saw on him when he had been baptized, and the sight of it was granted to me so that by my announcement you too would recognize the author of your salvation. Hence as I testified earlier, so I now also testify that this is the Son of God from whom, as from the heavenly well-spring, you are to ask for all things that concern righteousness and eternal happiness. For I will not allow you to suppose greater things about me than I deserve, or to be in ignorance of him, the knowledge of whom is salvation.'

By testimony of this kind John repeatedly commended Jesus, still unknown, to the people, and transferred his own authority to Jesus as to a superior, so that from then on he himself would be abandoned and they would follow Jesus' teaching. Divine providence was operating in this process so that in both of them a wholesome example of a gospel teacher would be provided for us. John, indeed, was not so corrupted by the enticement of so much glory spontaneously offering itself to him as to claim for himself the honour that belonged to another; and he did not keep silent about Christ's glory out of fear of the jealousy of the priests and Pharisees, whose self-seeking envy and envious self-seeking did not endure that anyone except themselves be glorified; and he did not look to his own advantage but to what was in the people's best interest. Truly, he taught that the herald of the gospel must keep his heart strong and unbroken not only against lust and greed but also against all self-seeking, even without regard for his own life. Then Jesus Christ, in coming to baptism like one of the common people, in conducting himself among John's disciples like one of them though he was Lord of all, taught us that the approach to true glory is through extreme abasement of the soul and through self-restraint, and that none is a fit teacher except one who has been a good student, and that no one should rush forward to the task of teaching unless he has been in every way tested and approved and as it were divinely admitted to it.

Now so that John's unparalleled integrity would shine out more, he was not satisfied to have turned the people's enthusiasm aside from himself to Christ; he even sought to separate his own disciples from himself and hand them over to Christ. For on the day after the things we have just related were done before the people, John was again standing there, and two of his disciples were with their teacher. Meanwhile Jesus was walking about not far away. And this took place not without a mystical meaning to the event.[120] For John was playing the part of an image of the law of Moses; Christ was the author of the gospel proclamation. Hence the law, which now had come to its furthest limit,[121] was standing still, as not going any further but soon to stop and give way to Christ when he came, and to hand over its disciples to him; but for now steadfastly giving witness about Christ and as it were handing over the synagogue to her true bridegroom,[122] to be his church. Christ was walking about, as one who would always be advancing to something greater, and who was gathering disciples of his heavenly teaching from all sides. So when John, as he stood there, looked at[123] Jesus walking, well aware that Jesus thirsted for the salvation of the human race and was seeking disciples suitable for his lofty teaching, he turned to his disciples as they were standing beside their mentor and, in order to hand them over to Jesus, a better teacher than himself, he pointed to Jesus walking and said, 'Look, he is the lamb of God about whom I have now given witness so many times, the one who alone takes away all the sins of the whole world. It is he for whom I have prepared you. Whoever longs for true and effective baptism, whoever loves true innocence, whoever longs for true and complete salvation, must give himself over to his teaching.' For those who had been true worshippers of the law of Moses, by the evidence of that very law have advanced to the perfection of the gospel, that is, from faith to faith,[124] while the Pharisees in their perverted zeal for the law persecuted him whom the law had commended to them. So John's disciples made no reply to their teacher, but having faith in his words, they left John, the forerunner of the gospel, and followed Jesus, the author of the gospel salvation. Yet they followed him in silence, burning with passion for a higher teaching, the hope of which they had formed from John's testimony; but they did not dare address him, since they were not yet on familiar terms with him.[125]

Jesus, understanding what their purpose was in following him, wanted to make clear how accessible he was to those who with honest hearts thirst for the gospel teaching; so he did not wait for them to address him but willingly lightened and lured their diffidence. He turned towards them and now looking at them following him – not that he did not know whom they were following or why they were following, but to show to others that these men's desire was worthy of the gospel – he greeted them and asked them what they wanted, so that their desire, once made known, would kindle the hearts of others also. And they, proclaiming in the very word they used that they were gripped with a longing to learn, said, 'Rabbi' (which means 'teacher' in Syrian),[126] 'where do you live?' That is, by calling him teacher they proclaimed themselves his students, and in asking where his dwelling was, they made clear that they wanted to learn on more familiar terms the more hidden things that perhaps he would not say publicly.[127] At this, delighted by their devout fervour to learn, our Lord Jesus did not plead the imminence of nightfall; he did not bid them come back the next day;[128] he did not give directions to his house if they should want to visit him sometime when an opportunity arose; but he obligingly and agreeably invited them to conversation at his house, saying, 'Come and see.' For he had realized that any delay would be damaging to their fervent longing. Happy at this much desired answer, they came, and not only saw the dwelling where Jesus lived but stayed with him that day; and they were so fired by his holy conversation that they not only rejoiced with each other but also invited others to share this joy. Now when they went to Jesus' dwelling it was about the tenth hour, and the sun was already sinking towards its setting. For there is no time, no place, that is not seasonable for learning the things that pertain to eternal salvation,[129] and the gospel teacher's abundance must always be in readiness.[130] For to be so befits one who proclaims that he is a teacher of the philosophy of Christ,[131] the only philosophy that has no knowledge of arrogance.

Now one of the two who had followed Jesus at John's urging was Andrew, the elder brother[132] of Simon Peter (to whom, younger though he was, Jesus later promised the keys of the kingdom of heaven because of the outstanding fervour of his faith, and also entrusted to him, when Peter had three times proclaimed his love, the feeding of his sheep).[133] The gospel religion is far different from the world's temperament: if it gains some notable treasure it does not hide it, begrudging it to others (for many people think that they do not possess what they share with many), but rejoices to share its good with others.[134] Andrew rejoiced in so much happiness, because he had found out from John's evidence and much more certainly from the conversation at Jesus' house that Jesus was the heavenly lamb that alone would take away the sin of the world, he was the Son of God, the one reconciler of the human race, he was the Christ promised by the prophets and awaited now for so many generations. As soon as he found his brother Simon Peter, whose presence he greatly desired so that he could share with him the happiness of such certain knowledge, because he knew Simon had waited for Christ's coming with great fervour, he said, 'We have found the messiah whom the prophets promised as redeemer of the world.' 'Messiah' means 'Christ' in the language of the Syrians, that is, 'anointed one,'[135] because anointing is a sign of kings and priests. But Christ alone is anointed by God; to him alone is given all power in heaven and earth; he alone is the priest forever after the order of Melchizedek,[136] who by the offering of his own body reconciled the entire race of mortals to God. Joyful at such longed-for news and not content with having heard it, Simon too was eager to see Jesus for himself. Andrew, having already experienced the affability and kindness of our Lord Jesus, promptly led Simon to him. And Jesus, looking at Peter, observed not only the man's face, in which indeed the sincerity of his heart shone out, but much more his soul, endowed with dovelike simplicity[137] and therefore fit for the gospel grace. Delighting in Peter's wholehearted desire, Jesus both mentioned the name of Peter's father, even then showing that nothing was hidden from him,[138] and also praised the devout simplicity of his heart on the evidence of his father's name, and from the riddle of his changed name foretold that one day there would be in him the firmness of undefeated faith. For Jonah means 'dove' or 'grace'; Simeon means 'obedient.'[139] And in fact the ascent to the gospel faith is from the obedience of the Mosaic law. So Jesus, looking at him, both loved his present simplicity and hinted, as in a riddle, at his future solidity, saying, 'You are Simon the son of John, matching both your own and your father's name. But when your faith has gathered strength, so that it can stand unshaken against all the temptations of Satan, you will be called Cephas,' which in Greek is 'Peter' and in Latin 'Rock.'[140] And this was the first beginning of the church of Christ; this was the start of the school of the gospel.[141]

On the next day Jesus decided to go into Galilee, the most despised region of Judea at that time, because no greatly renowned person had ever come from there,[142] though a prophecy of Isaiah had predicted that the light of the gospel would first arise in that area.[143] And going there seemed best in the divine purpose so that he could begin his church with lowly, unlearned, and ignorant men, sprung from a sterile and despised land. For both Peter and Andrew, who followed Christ unbidden, were Galileans. Further, the fact that brother had drawn brother to Jesus was a good omen for the new-born church, which is formed of brotherly love and mutual harmony. So as he was about to depart into Galilee, already accompanied by two Galilean disciples, wanting to go with a somewhat larger company Jesus took two more of the same birth and rank. He found one Philip, from the Galilean town of Bethsaida; it is next to Lake Gennesaret,[144] the birthplace of Andrew and Simon who was surnamed Peter. Now the shared birthplace was also an omen of gospel harmony, and an omen that the differences of all nations would come together in one church as in one city. It seemed to be chance that they met Philip, but the whole affair was being carried out by the providence of God, who had already from before time determined whom he wished to be the leaders of the church. And so when Philip met them Jesus said, 'Follow me.' Without delay he immediately followed Jesus, about whom he already knew a good deal from John's testimony and from people's talk.[145] The words of the speaker were powerful and the heart of the listener was of its own accord inclined to heed.

Now, it happened that as Andrew had drawn his brother Simon, so Philip, already happy in Jesus' instruction, did the same. He found[146] Nathanael, who he knew was gripped by an incredible longing for the coming of the messiah and was therefore in the habit of searching very diligently in the predictions of the law and the prophets to learn when and whence he would come, and wanting to share the joy in which he was taking complete delight, he said, 'We have found the true messiah[147] about whom Moses wrote that a prophet would arise from the house of Israel, and about whom so many predictions of the prophets have told. He is Jesus the son of Joseph, of Nazareth.' For at this time Jesus was still thought by everyone to be the son of Joseph, and he was better known by Joseph's name than by that of his mother Mary. Also he was commonly said to be from Nazareth not because he was born there, since Bethlehem was hallowed as the place of his infancy, but because from boyhood he had lived there with his parents and been raised by them there.[148] When Nathanael heard this, he was favourably inclined towards the happy news, but was checked by a doubt raised in his mind by the prophecy that plainly promised that Christ would come from Bethlehem.[149] So, wanting to be informed more definitely, he said to Philip, 'But can anything good come from Nazareth, a town which the predictions of the prophets do not mention?'[150] Since Philip himself, still ignorant and possessing nothing except simple faith, could not untangle this knot, he invited him to the very source,[151] not doubting that once he had seen and heard Jesus he would immediately believe. 'If you hesitate to trust me,' he said, 'come yourself and see.'

Now Jesus was not yet famous for doing miracles; in order to suggest his divine power by his knowledge of hidden things,[152] when he saw Nathanael coming toward him, before he was told about him by Philip or addressed by Nathanael, he turned to his disciples, pointed to Nathanael, and said, 'Look, a true Israelite, in whom there is no deceit.' In these words Jesus commended both Nathanael's simple belief and his wholehearted desire to learn, while those who falsely boasted that they are Israelites are generally over-scrupulous out of a desire to slander.[153] Nathanael understood that Jesus was indicating in these words that Nathanael's conversation with Philip about him was no secret from him, and he wondered how this could have reached Jesus' knowledge, for so far he did not suppose that Jesus was anything other than human. 'Where did you learn about me?' he said. But Jesus, showing even more clearly that human thoughts, no matter how secret, are not concealed from him, said, 'Before Philip called you, when you were under the fig-tree, I had already seen you.' The conversation had been between the two men, and there had been no witness who could have reported it. The place was specified, and as in a mystery the fig was mentioned in passing, the accomplice of the first trespass, from which those must depart who wish to acknowledge Christ.[154] From these clues it was plain that the content of the whole conversation also was known to Jesus, but he made no annoying mention of it lest he seem to the modest man who was asking a straightforward question to be reproaching his unbelief. Nathanael was convinced that the secrets of the heart could be seen only by God and that what he was hearing was more than human,[155] and as soon as he heard these things, he was no longer checked by the doubt about the name of the birthplace. In full faith he gave witness to Christ and said, 'Rabbi, you are the Son of God through whom the Father has determined to set his people free; you are the king of Israel once promised by the predictions of the prophets.' Gladly welcoming the man's faith so ready and eager, and his proclamation so suited to the gospel, Jesus strengthened Nathanael's opinion about himself and, now showing his divine nature more openly, said, 'You have formed your faith that I am the messiah and the king of Israel from the fact that I said I saw you when you were with Philip under the fig-tree, and on that account you think highly of me. Some day you will see clearer signs, and from them your good opinion of me will increase.'

And soon, turning to the rest of the disciples too, none of whom yet had as high a regard for him as he deserved, Jesus said, 'Be sure of this: some day you will see the skies open and the angels of God going up and down above the Son of man.' In this riddle our Lord Jesus aroused his followers' faith, simple and wholehearted indeed but still ignorant and far from the perfect knowledge of Christ's loftiness, to look for greater miracles and from them a higher knowledge. For though the disciples, as in a daze, marvelled at something more than human in Christ, nonetheless they did not yet fully believe that the fullness of divinity was in him. Nathanael[156] proclaimed the same things that Peter later proclaimed, but because he did not do it with the same meaning he did not hear the same things that Peter heard ('on this rock I will build my church,' and 'to you I will give the keys of the kingdom of heaven').[157] The reason was that in Holy Scripture men of outstanding sanctity are called sons of God,[158] and others too, by the inspiration of the divine spirit, sometimes even foresee the future, so it is not entirely surprising if without a messenger Christ knew what had taken place privately between the two disciples. And besides, the fact that Nathanael called Jesus king of Israel, as if wanting to do him honour with a splendid title, indicates that he was still day-dreaming about an earthly kingdom. But it is an earthly and lowly thing to have a kingdom in this world, and far loftier to be king of the whole universe and even of the angels. Jesus hinted at that when he said that the angels, like zealous servants, would go up and down in eager obedience above the Son of man. But although the disciples at that time had not understood these words of Jesus, still he buried them in their hearts like seed, to sprout in its season. For we learned later that angels had often acknowledged the king of all by their service: when Gabriel announced his conception; when they sang 'Glory to God in the highest' at his birth; then when appearing to Joseph they provided for the child's safety; later when they ministered to him after the temptation by Satan; in offering him comfort as he sweated in agony; in appearing often at the resurrection. And again, when he was lifted into heaven before the eyes of all, the angels were there, guarantors of his promised return.[159] But their most important appearance will be when he comes in cloud, with the majesty of the Father, with the whole host of angels, to judge the living and the dead, and to hand over the kingdom to our God and Father.[160]

Chapter 2

He did not linger in Galilee long before beginning to make it clear by performing a miracle that John's testimony about him was not false. In fact Jesus was better known in Galilee than in the other districts of Judea,[1] but so far they thought nothing remarkable about him because even his brothers' and relatives' opinion of him was still spiteful.[2] On the third day after he arrived in Galilee, a wedding was being held in Cana, a town of that district. Jesus' mother had been invited to it because of a family connection,[3] and for this reason Jesus also was invited, and the four disciples he had just gathered.

The banquet had grown quite lively,[4] and because the wine was running low the bridegroom was in danger of embarrassment for not having arranged for a sufficiently lavish celebration. There was also some fear that the banquet would become less cheerful if the guests were uneasy on this point. Jesus' mother Mary already knew her son's power from many indications and also from John's testimony,[5] and with a kind of feminine concern she wanted to mend the difficulty; so she unhesitatingly spoke to him, saying, 'Son, they have no wine.' That she dared to address him was due to her authority as his mother; that she did not specify what she wanted done was due to her respect for her son.

But now that Jesus was on the point of starting on the heavenly task of the gospel, for which he meant only his Father to be his authority, he did not allow any human authority to be superimposed.[6] He was not performing miracles to oblige the desires of his relatives, but to prepare the way for faith in his spiritual teaching by physical signs among an unbelieving nation. So he answered his mother rather sternly – not that he, who loved the whole human race, did not have a singular affection for her as his mother, but so that he could separate the authority for his miracles from human desires and claim the whole glory for divine power. For this was best for the salvation of mankind, for which he thirsted. And so he did not refuse his mother but he did make it clear that she had nothing to do with the authority for the work that was to be done; he replied, 'Woman, what business do I have with you? I have a time set by my Father, when and how I am to carry out the task of human salvation, but it has not yet come. Till now I have obeyed your wishes. What remains now must be done as the Father decides, not as a mortal requires. Before, you were my mother; from now on, as long as I am busy about my Father's business, you will be nothing else to me but a woman. As long as there is his glory to be served, there will be no need for you to intervene.[7] Of my own accord I will do what the situation demands; I have a time set by my Father.' While he was still a boy he had already warned his mother in this way, because she interrupted him when he was debating in the temple.[8] He warned her again in the same way when she had him called out while he was preaching to the people.[9]

Mary the mother of Jesus was not offended by her son's rather stern answer, and had no mistrust of either his kindness or his power.[10] She made no reply to him but summoned the attendants and told them privately, 'Whatever he orders you to do, do it.' The devoted concern of the mother saw to it that neither the servants' unbelief nor any reluctance to obey prevented help being provided for the banquet. But she quietly left the decision about time and method to her son. This did not at all happen by chance; Jesus was deliberately delaying so that the shortage of wine would become known to everyone and the miracle would clearly be given for necessity, not for show.[11] The Lord did all his miracles in this way, so that they were clearly not aimed at human praise but were applied to the relief of human ills, and he did them with the sequence of events so governed that they could not be done with greater or more certain credibility.

So now, with the guests waiting and disturbed by the lack of wine, Jesus thought that it was time for him to become known to his own people. Six stone water-jars were standing there so that if anyone wished to purify himself by washing in the Jewish manner, he would have a supply of water at hand, since the district was arid and nowhere well watered by springs and streams.[12] Jesus ordered the attendants to fill these jars with water. This too, of course, made for faith in the miracle, that the jars were in regular use and never had held any other liquid but water.[13] What is more, the size of the jars also made for faith in the miracle, for each one held two or three measures,[14] and so they could not be easily moved from their place. The servants obeyed, and filled the jars with water to the brim, as they had been ordered. Then, so that he would have more witnesses of the miracle, Jesus ordered them to draw from the jars and offer what they drew to the steward, who was in charge of the banquet arrangements.[15] The steward, partly because he was sober[16] (for it was customary for the one in charge of arrangements to abstain while the others drank), and partly because he was a man of cultivated tastes and had a discriminating palate, could pass judgment on the wine with greater credibility than the other guests, whose palates perhaps had been dulled by so much wine.

When the steward tasted the wine made from water, not knowing where it had been drawn from, he suspected that the attendants had mistakenly put off such fine wine till the end of the banquet, contrary to the usual custom. He called the bridegroom to him and wanted to know how the mistake had happened. 'Others who give the usual banquet,' he said, 'serve the best wines at the beginning of the banquet; later, when people are already intoxicated and less particular in their tastes, and are drinking with less restraint, they serve the poorer wine. But you have saved this wine, finer than any served so far, for the end of the banquet.' From this remark word of the wonderful thing done leaked out[17] to several others, and then, after the servants were questioned, it was learned that water was not only turned into wine, but into the best wine.[18] It was quite certain that the jars had been set aside for water only. The attendants had added water to water up to the brim, and the same attendants had offered to a sober steward a draught from what they had poured in. The bridegroom knew that such wine had not been part of the arrangements. They went to the water-jars and discovered that they were full of wine of the same fine quality.

Our Lord Jesus, who was gradually[19] going to offer to the world evidence of his divine power, began the performance of miracles with this deed in Cana of Galilee. This first one was done privately and in a not very serious matter, and it was almost an indulgence of the desires of his mother and his relatives, who thought of Jesus the more disdainfully because they were connected to him by blood. The sign was not noticed by very many at the time, though later the news spread with greater conviction to more people. Yet even the faith of the disciples who were present was strengthened concerning Jesus, because he who promised greater things made good on what he had promised. And still this sign, in which he was rehearsing, so to speak,[20] for other signs, was not an idle one. For in the first place he wanted to honour weddings with his presence, foreseeing that there would some day be those who condemned them as filthy, though an honourable marriage and an unstained marriage-bed is a thing most pleasing to God.[21] Next, Jesus was foreshadowing for us what he was on the point of undertaking, as if in a sort of image. For it was now time for us to drink the fine wine of the gospel instead of the tasteless and watered-down letter of the law of Moses,[22] with Christ changing for the better what was powerless and useless to us. For without Christ the law was not only tasteless but also destructive to the Jews. Those who have not believed in the gospel still drink the water of the law of Moses; those who have believed in Christ grow blessedly warm[23] towards the love of heavenly life and flourish on the new vintage of spiritual teaching.[24] And this did not happen until Christ joined the church to himself as his bride.[25] Third, the mother of Jesus was there as the image of the synagogue,[26] whose authority is being diminished; yet she advises him about the wine, though she does not provide it herself. But she gave birth to him for us, and he makes our minds merry with the unwatered wine of his spirit. The very names of the places give a warrant of the mystery of the event. In fact 'Cana of Galilee' means 'possession of transmigration.'[27] For now the breeding ground of a new people had been gathered together to migrate from the letter of the law to the spirit of the gospel, from the world to heaven.

Once Jesus had begun the proclamation of his power with this sign, in a little-known town among his relatives, he went down to Capernaum. That city is also in Galilee of the peoples, next to Lake Gennesaret, neighbouring on Zebulun and Naphtali; because of the influx of wealth it was swimming in luxury and swollen with pride. Of course according to the gospel philosophy what is raised high in the world is cast down before God.[28] His mother and brothers and disciples went down with him, and they stayed there for a few days, but no miracle was performed. In fact this period appears to have been given as their due to the feelings of his mother and relatives, whom he did not want to accompany him on his rounds any further (for he was about to undertake greater things), so that human affection would not claim for itself anything of what was being done for the glory of the heavenly Father.[29] So leaving his relatives at Capernaum, Jesus sought a proper time and place for proclaiming the power and authority which he had received from the heavenly Father, not from humans.

Now the most famous holy day of the Jews was approaching. It is called Pascha, which means in Hebrew Passover. They celebrated it every year in remembrance of the old story that their ancestors had safely passed over out of Egypt to seek the land promised by God. In fact what they celebrated in an image was actually done through Christ, that through the gospel faith people might leave behind the shadows of their errors and the darkness of their sins, and pass over to innocence, light, and immortality.[30] So since at that time there was a huge throng of people at Jerusalem, who had come from all the districts of Syria for the festival, Jesus went in that direction, going up to his Father's work as he had accommodated his relatives and gone down to Capernaum.

He presently entered the temple, a place that for religious reasons was regularly thronged with many people. But Christ was the teacher of true religion. When he went into the temple, dedicated as it was to religion and divine worship, he was confronted with the sight of a market, not a temple. For he found very many there who were engaged in disgraceful and even dishonest profiteering[31] in the holy place, and who were turning an occasion of religion to robbery. So that visitors would have something to sacrifice, these men were actually selling at high prices sheep, cattle, doves, and other such things that it is the Jewish custom to sacrifice or to give to the priests. But they had made an agreement with the priests and Levites to sell back to the sellers at a lower price the same animals received from those offering sacrifices, so they could be sold again to other visitors at a profit.[32] So it happened that the visitors were cheated and the dishonest gain coming from selling the same animal more than once was split between the tradesmen and the Levites. In order for the transactions to go more smoothly, something that generally existed in a secular market was also found here: there were actually money-changers or bankers[33] there to change large coins for smaller ones or gold for silver or foreign money for the local coinage; and there was a dishonest profit here too, not much different from usury.

In what he did then Jesus taught what a great plague upon the church is the shameless desire for money and how far removed from it those should be who declare themselves leaders of the gospel religion. He braided himself a whip[34] out of ropes, as if to whip the dogs out of the house of God, and with great indignation and great authority he drove them all out of the temple, forcing the tradesmen out along with their wares. For he not only expelled the people but also the sheep and cattle, so there would be no such filth lingering about. What is more, he even spilled the bankers' money on the ground and overturned their stands, showing that these things are to be trampled underfoot by worshippers of the true religion. And to those selling doves he said in a rage, 'Get them out of here, and do not make my Father's house a house of trade.'

When the disciples saw Jesus, otherwise calm and gentle, so harshly whipping those who were profaning the religion of the temple with disgraceful profiteering, they remembered the prophecy in Psalm 68: 'Zeal for your house consumes me' [69:9]. But when the Jews heard that by calling it the house of his Father he was in his own way declaring himself the Son of God, and saw him openly raging with so much authority against those who appeared to be serving the purposes of the priests and religion, they raised a protest against him and said, 'If God is your Father, and if you are righting wrongs against your Father, do a miracle so we may know that you are acting on your Father's authority. If you are doing this on your own authority, it is foolhardiness; if on divine authority, what sign do you offer so that we may believe in you?'

But Jesus knew that they would slander him no matter what miracle he performed as a demonstration, while he never did a miracle except to meet the needs of those in want, so that what was proof of divine power would also be a help to human need. He promised them a sign in a paradox,[35] for if he had at that time said it plainly they would not have believed it, since they did not even believe it when it was shown to them. This was the sign of his death and resurrection. It was also the sign of Jonah,[36] which he promised after many miracles had been performed and they were still demanding a sign. But now when they were still ignorant he promised it a little more covertly. The temple where they were, in which the Jews used to boast excessively, offered the theme for his words: 'Destroy this temple,' he said, 'and in three days I will raise it up.' At that point not even the apostles understood the puzzle; but in the end after his resurrection became known they learned the meaning of his remarks from the event. For Jesus was thinking of the temple of his body, which the Jews would destroy in death because of their wickedness, while by divine power he would raise it again in three days. To the Jews this seemed to be a sinful as well as a foolish thing to say. For it was sinful to bid a temple of so much sanctity to be destroyed; it seemed foolish to say that he would raise such an elaborate piece of workmanship in three days' time. Their reply exactly matched their understanding: 'Forty-six years' sweat went to rebuild this temple after the Babylonian captivity,'[37] they said, 'and are you going to raise it in three days?'

Our Lord Jesus did not reply to that objection, knowing that he would do no good if he uncovered the hidden meaning of his remark, since not even later, when the disciples had been taught by the performance of so many miracles and by so many clear statements, could they endure mention of his death or believe in the mystery of the resurrection. Yet this saying stayed fixed like a seed[38] in the hearts of the listeners, though it bore different fruit in different ones. Remembering the remark, the Jews made it a capital charge against him before their wicked priests. As for the disciples, storing in their hearts what they could not understand, they wondered what he meant until, when the resurrection had occurred, the Holy Spirit taught them that with the word temple Christ had referred to his own body. His body was a much more sanctified temple than the one which the Jews scrupulously revered as if the fullness of godhead dwelt in it. Yet it was sacrilege to violate the temple of stone, though they did not fear wickedly to tear down the most sanctified temple of his most holy body. But this same Solomon, who had built himself this temple from the Virgin Mary, when it had been destroyed by the Jews restored it in three days, according to the predictions of the prophets.[39] So at that time the disciples compared the Scriptures with Jesus' words and understood that this was the chief sign by which he proclaimed his divinity to the Jews. For though we read that several people have lived again,[40] yet no one except our Lord Jesus alone raised himself to life. He alone had within himself the power to lay down his life and to take it up again when he chose.

As the festival drew near, Jesus roused the expectation of the whole Jewish race for himself with such beginnings. When he had stayed at Jerusalem for the several days of the Passover and had sown some seeds of the gospel faith by both signs and teaching, many trusted in his words, believing that he was the Son of God as he announced he was, though they were more moved by the miracles he did than by his words. For the Jews are not so much moved by reason as they are by seeing wonders.[41] Already at that time Jesus was showing us the shape and model of a teacher of the gospel, who is wise enough not to entrust the mysteries of an elevated doctrine to the hearts of the ignorant all at once, and who is gentle enough to bear with those who are still weak and imperfect until they advance to higher things.[42] Since he knew that their faith was still unformed and hesitant, and their hearts were not yet ready for the mysteries of the gospel philosophy, to avoid the possibility that the enthusiasm of the people would suddenly reverse itself and an uproar arise, he did not entrust himself to the general crowd. For there were many who were irked by his authority, especially those who thought that Jesus' teaching and glory would hinder their own profit and authority. The malice of the Pharisees and scribes had not yet broken out into open abuse, but they harboured envy and ill will in their hearts, grasping at any chance to injure him. Therefore, since Jesus was not yet able to do any good, he withdrew from them to avoid offering to evil people the opportunity for greater evil, because he knew the secret thoughts of everyone. And he had no need for anyone to give evidence to him about human nature. For he himself, whom nothing escaped, of himself knew what lay hidden in the secret places of the hearts of everyone. Jesus was not considering his own welfare, for he had willingly come to face death for the welfare of the world; he was removing the material for sin from their evil purposes.

Chapter 3

Now among the many who had formed some opinion about Jesus from seeing his miracles was a man named Nicodemus, of the sect of the Pharisees and in rank one of those considered leading men among the Jews. Well aware that there were many of his class and sect who were rather envious of Jesus and were plotting against him, he came to Jesus, but at night. He showed in his action that he was still weak and wavering in love for Jesus, whom he did not admire enough to suffer a loss in his own position in society for Jesus' sake or on Jesus' account to be subjected to the malice of his own class. But it was fear rather than impiety, and a human kind of embarrassment rather than perversity.[1] In the souls of some people such embarrassment is so powerful that those who can treat life and property lightly cannot overcome this feeling, which is particularly characteristic of the well-born. For it embarrassed him, as one who stood out in honour among the chief men of the Jewish race, to seem to be a disciple of the humble Jesus; he was afraid that though he had been granted the right of first seat in the synagogue, he would be banned from the synagogue.[2] But Jesus, gentlest of teachers, who does not crush the broken reed or snuff out the smoking wick,[3] did not reject his frightened and untimely visitor. He welcomed him kindly, a weak man to be sure, but innocent of evil intent and therefore worthy to be gradually drawn on to higher things. And Nicodemus, promptly revealing how much he had gained from seeing Jesus' miracles, appealed to his listener's good will[4] with this opening remark: 'Rabbi, we have already observed that your teaching is not like that of the Pharisees. For the case speaks for itself;[5] your very authority for teaching has been granted not by a mortal but by God. No one could do the wonders you show us unless he had God with him and assisting him.' Nicodemus offered this as a splendid and grand opinion about Jesus, though it was far less than what Jesus deserved.[6] For he did not suspect that Jesus was anything other than a prophet whom God favoured and aided in performing miracles, as if he did not do them by his own power.

But Jesus did not refute the man's imperfect opinion, nor did he immediately boast how great he was, but with gentle friendliness he gradually drew his willing pupil on to the deeper mysteries of the gospel teaching.[7] The Jews so far had only drunk the water of the Mosaic law, and knew nothing beyond the baptism of John; they had not yet tasted the wine of the gospel teaching[8] or been baptized in fire[9] and Spirit. They knew nothing but the flesh and were therefore quite ignorant of the gospel philosophy, which is entirely spiritual. So the Lord did not reprove him for his ignorance or for his soul limping on both feet[10] and dividing itself between the world and God; he did not yet bring up what he later required of his more advanced disciples: whoever is ashamed of me before men, I will be ashamed of him before the Father.[11] Instead he drew out the man's ignorance by puzzling remarks, so that he could instruct him gradually and change him from unspiritual feelings to spiritual knowledge. He said, 'Nicodemus, you may be sure that unless one is reborn anew[12] as it were into a new person, he cannot see the kingdom of God. So novel is this teaching that you want to hear from me.'

Since Nicodemus thought that was a senseless thing to say, he gave a stupid but honest answer: 'How can a man of mature years, as I am, be born again? How could he go back into his mother's womb and come out again like a baby?' Jesus was not offended even by this quite foolish answer,[13] or annoyed at having to explain what it means to be born again or from above.[14] He said, 'What I said is quite true, Nicodemus, that whoever wants to be fit for the gospel teaching must be reborn, but it is another kind of birth that we are talking about. For it is not physical but spiritual, and it does not consist in the procreation of bodies but in the transformation[15] of souls. And we are not made children of men a second time by this birth, but children of God. So be sure, as I have just said, that unless one is born again through water and the Holy Spirit, and instead of being unspiritual becomes spiritual, he cannot enter the kingdom of God, which is certainly spiritual. Like is born from like.[16] What is born from flesh is only flesh, but what is born from spirit is spirit. As much difference as there is between flesh and spirit, between body and God, so much more excellent is this birth of which I speak than that which produces a body from a body. Those who are born according to the flesh know nothing other than the flesh; they think there is nothing except what they perceive with their senses. But the things that are not seen are the most important and have the greatest power, while the flesh is weak and helpless.[17] So since it is a different way of being born, you need not wonder that a person born according to the flesh and therefore a child of man must also be reborn invisibly, according to the Spirit, in order to be a child of God, who is spirit, and to be fit for the kingdom of heaven, which is spiritual, not physical. But if in your heart you still do not follow, take an example from things that have some similarity to the spiritual, and yet are perceived by the physical senses.[18] God is purest spirit[19] and far removed from all physical senses, but this air in which we thrive and whose great power and usefulness we perceive is called spirit[20] because compared to our bodies it is so much less dense. This spirit is not controlled by human will[21] but goes wherever[22] it chooses on its own impulse, spreading itself through everything, implanting its marvellous force in physical objects, sometimes bringing life and sometimes death; now calm and quiet, now stronger again, blowing sometimes from the east, sometimes from the west, sometimes from any of the other directions of the world. It reveals itself by its effects, and you can hear its voice, though you see no body and there is nothing that you can seize in your hands. You feel its presence; you do not see it coming, and you do not see where it is going when it departs. This spiritual birth has something similar about it. In secret inspirations mortal minds are seized and transformed by the Spirit of God. An indescribable power and effect is felt, but mortal eyes do not see what is being done. And those who are thus reborn are not then driven by the human and physical spirit but by the Spirit of God, who quickens and governs all things.'

Nicodemus was still rather at a loss; he did not indeed dispute Jesus, but, not following the meaning of his words and wanting to have what he had heard explained more clearly, he said, 'How can it possibly be that a flesh and blood human being is born again into spirit and is born divine from God?' Jesus showed that the things that belong to heavenly teaching are imperceptible to human reasoning but are grasped rather by faith,[23] and that they cannot be learned by the philosophers of the world, swollen with human wisdom, or by the Pharisees, who were proclaiming the letter of the law arrogantly in ignorance of its spirit; he showed that it is the wisdom that the heavenly Father hides from the wise men of this age and reveals to those who in the world's view are humble and ordinary.[24] He answered Nicodemus, 'You are regarded as a teacher[25] in Israel, and you claim to instruct the people, and are you ignorant of the very things you especially ought to know? How far the people must be from spiritual teaching if you, so great a teacher of the people, don't understand these things! But now it would be better to have faith in what you cannot understand with the intellect. Faith will make it possible for you to perceive this, even if you don't see it. For if you cannot understand the nature and force of this earthly air with your reason, how will you follow matters far more elevated and more removed from every physical perception? Surely, since they are divine, they far surpass human minds, unless the minds are themselves inspired by the Spirit of God. But you may safely have faith in me, for I not only sense or have heard of divine matters by inspiration, as the prophets, one of whom you think I am, sensed them, but we speak of things definitely and certainly known, and the things we have seen in heaven are the things of which we bear witness on earth to you. But all of you who have not yet been reborn through the Spirit do not believe in these spiritual things. You believe a man who bears witness to what he has seen with his physical eyes, and you do not believe one who, himself from heaven, saw things in heaven with spiritual eyes. As heavenly things exist more surely than earthly things, so they are more surely seen by one who has heavenly eyes.'

But[26] Jesus was saying this in a veiled way, meaning that he had a divine nature though he was clothed in a mortal body, and that the testimony Nicodemus had given him as something splendid because, as Nicodemus understood it, he had been sent from God was far less than the honour he deserved. At this point Nicodemus certainly understood nothing more profound about Jesus than that he had been sent by God as the other prophets are reported to have been sent by God, and as John had been sent by God. But God had sent his Son in a much higher sense, because he had been with his Father forever before he was sent, and still then was with his Father according to his divine nature, whereby he never is separated from the Father. What he had said before about rebirth through water and the Spirit could seem rather coarse compared to the depth of this mystery, how a divine nature could be joined with a human one in the same person, so that one and the same individual lived as a mortal man on earth and simultaneously was God immortal with his Father. So our Lord Jesus added, 'If because of your[27] soul's unspiritual understanding you do not believe me when so far I have been telling you earthly things, how would you believe me[28] if I tell you things that are clearly heavenly, which I have seen myself and know more surely than what you see with your physical eyes? But what man or angel has ever been great enough to ascend[29] into heaven to contemplate heavenly things and to look upon the divine nature itself, as it really is, face to face? No one, certainly, has ascended into heaven except the Son of man, who has come down from heaven to earth but even now dwells in heaven,[30] never separated from contemplation of the divine, though for the present he seems humble and unknown on earth. But it seemed best for the divine purpose to declare the glory of God to the world by means of utter dishonour and humility, so that people would abandon false glory and hasten by the same road to true and eternal glory.

'But if someone should ask what necessity compelled the Son of God to come down from heaven and live on earth humbly and meanly, there was no other reason than the utter love of God the Father for the human race, for whose salvation he handed over his only-begotten Son to death, and in the world's eyes a death of shame.[31] He chose to expend one for the salvation of all.[32] This should not seem unexpected or novel to you, Nicodemus. It is exactly what Moses foreshadowed would happen when, at the time that the people were dying from an attack by serpents, he hung a bronze serpent on a pole so that whoever looked in its direction would be safe from the fatal bite. That bronze serpent, which had the appearance of a poisonous beast but was so far without poison that it even set free others touched by poison, was hung up in the desert so that it was visible to all for their own safety;[33] likewise the Son of man must be lifted up so that all who by faith raise their eyes to him may be freed from the deadly poison of sin. In this way not only the Israelites but every single human being who pure-heartedly puts his trust in him may not perish in bondage to sin, which brings everlasting death, but by the death of one innocent one may obtain eternal life.'

By riddling statements of this kind our Lord Jesus revealed the mystery of his taking human form and redeeming the world by the cross, admittedly to one not yet fit for such things; at the same time he revealed what a great difference there is between those who read the law unspiritually, noticing nothing beyond the story, and those who, by the inspiration of the Spirit, as mentioned, perceive the secret meaning hidden under cover of Scripture. Nonetheless our Lord Jesus then sowed these seeds of faith in Nicodemus' soul so that later he would understand that this had happened not by chance but by divine purpose, and in this way good seed received in good ground[34] would yield the fruit of faith in its season – not only in the heart of him who heard it but in the souls of all to whom it would spread by way of Nicodemus' retelling.

For who was going to believe that God's love for a world in rebellion against him and in bondage to so many crimes was so great that he not only did not avenge the wrongs that had been committed but even sent his only Son down from heaven to earth and surrendered him to death, even the most shameful death of the cross, so that every human being, whether Jew or Greek or barbarian, who believed in him would not perish but would attain everlasting life through the gospel faith?[35] For some day at the last coming[36] the Father is going to judge the whole world through the Son. But at this time, which was given for mercy, God did not send his Son to judge the world for its crimes but to bestow on the world by his own death free salvation by faith; and easy entry to salvation was given to all so that anyone who perishes willingly would have no excuse for his wickedness.[37] No restitution for earlier sins is required, no observance of the law, no circumcision.[38] Whoever merely believes in him is safe from condemnation; the only condition is that, once he embraces that by which eternal salvation is granted to all no matter how heavily burdened they are with sins, after his confession of the gospel he refrain from the sins of his former life and strive, in accordance with the teaching of him whose name he confesses, to come ever closer to perfect godliness.

Then whoever does not believe in the gospel, scorning God's great love for him and rejecting the salvation freely offered, has no need to be judged by anyone, since he openly condemns himself and renders himself bound to eternal punishment, because he rejects the means of gaining eternal life. Through his only-begotten Son God has offered salvation to everyone, and that by faith, that we might acknowledge and worship him as the source of salvation, and entrust our entire happiness to him. Whoever refuses this, and spurns God's goodness, so close at hand, and insults the Son whom the Father wished to be honoured, and considers his dying for us worthless, indisputably declares himself deserving of eternal punishment. For who does not understand that one who knowingly and willingly embraces the cause of his death and turns from what could have restored his health dies deservedly and by his own fault? Sin and error are the darkness of the soul, and sin gives birth to eternal death. The Son of God is the light of the world.[39] For truth is light. To believe in him is salvation. And so when, by God's graciousness, into a world in darkness from ignorance of the truth and countless sins there came light so that the world would know the truth, repent, and be saved, mankind loved its own darkness more than the light sent from heaven. If a sick man dies because he hides his illness from the doctor so as not to be cured, does he not pronounce sentence on himself because it is his own fault that he dies? Likewise, those who had bound themselves over to the world turned away from the offered light, because their works were evil. For as one who commits a shameful act loves the night and shuns the daylight lest his deeds be exposed, so those who are aware of their own guilt hate the light of the gospel truth, through which wickedness is exposed so that it may be corrected. And one who loves his sickness cannot be healed. To please God the sinner must be displeasing to himself. But one whose works are upright loves the sun, so that he may find praise for his good deeds.[40] So one who has a clear conscience, or at least who desires to be healed, and does not dissemble his own sins (for this also is truth, to know the evil one has and to desire the good one does not have) – such a one willingly offers himself to the light of the gospel so that his works may be known openly and the good ones may have their praise, because they have come not from the spirit of the world but from God, while the evil ones may be corrected. But those who claim perfect righteousness for themselves from observance of the law while within they are steeped in flaws of the soul, those who place happiness in the resources of philosophy or in the advantages of this world, live either in great darkness, if they do this sincerely, or in even worse darkness, if, blinded by their own desires, they cling tenaciously to what they know is evil and stubbornly turn their backs on what they see brings salvation.[41] Our Lord Jesus had planted seeds of such mysteries in Nicodemus' heart. And this is the Nicodemus who later used his authority to defend Jesus against the abuses of the Pharisees, saying that a man must not be condemned without examination of his deeds, and who provided a decent burial for him.[42]

Once these foundations of the gospel glory had been laid in Galilee and Jerusalem, Jesus went on to spread it more widely, going into Judea, the territory which is specifically named after Judah, ancestor of the tribe from which Jesus himself was descended, and he stayed there for a while with his disciples, beginning his gospel preaching from the same starting points that John had used; that is, he issued the call to repentance, and baptized.[43] At that time John also was still baptizing, for he had not yet been thrown into prison by Herod. But he was not now baptizing in the Jordan as usual, but in a less well known place called Aenon, not far from Salim, which means 'bubbling springs' in Syrian,[44] where there was plenty of water for baptisms. Many gathered there and were baptized by John. Some went to Jesus and were baptized by his disciples. Hence a jealousy of Jesus arose among some of John's disciples, because when he had only recently himself been baptized by John and had behaved like a disciple of John's and had been recommended to the people by John's witness, now he was suddenly behaving like John's equal or even superior, and his disciples were claiming as their own what till now only John had done.[45] At first they tried to discourage the people[46] from the baptism of Jesus' disciples, trying to convince them that John's baptism was more effective in washing away sins than Jesus' baptism. When they were unsuccessful in persuading the people of this, they complained to John, expecting him to be offended and to put a stop somehow to the competition. This human feeling of John's disciples contributed to the glory of Christ and drew even clearer testimony about Christ from John. But they made their complaint in these words: 'Teacher, the man who was recently with you when you were baptizing at the Jordan, who received baptism from you,[47] and whom you honoured with your testimony to the crowd when he was unknown to all, is now claiming for himself the same as you, publicly baptizing; and all are flocking to him, so that your authority is going to be overshadowed by him.' John's disciples said this with a certain human enthusiasm, wanting their teacher's glory to be greater day by day and therefore envying Christ, whose authority was likely to harm John's reputation.

When John heard it, he was eager to cure his disciples' distorted feelings in a way that would show that he not only was not offended that Jesus' glory, growing daily, was overshadowing his own, but that he even was extremely happy because he had fulfilled his assigned task and now the time of Christ was near, who was going to accomplish far grander things. So he replied in this fashion: 'Why do you with your human feelings want to boast about me? Are you asking that I make myself out to be greater than I am? No one can receive anything except what is given to him from heaven. These things are not done with human resources, but at God's direction. The task that he had assigned to me according to my ability[48] I have faithfully completed. My job was to be a herald; I issued the call to repentance and announced the approach of the kingdom of God. In the baptism of water I prepared many for the baptism of fire and Spirit;[49] I pointed out whom they must follow from now on and where they must seek complete salvation. If my authority carries weight with you, why do you not trust what I say? You yourselves are witnesses that many times I publicly declared that I am not the Christ, as many thought I was, and I was sent for nothing else than to go first and prepare the way for his coming. I am his servant; he is the master of all.[50] If he is now being made known to the world and his glory is overshadowing mine, I rejoice that my witness is true. For this was my only prayer, that my servitude would lead to this end. Indeed, the bride belongs to him who is truly the bridegroom, while he who is only the groomsman, not himself the bridegroom, does not envy the groom his happiness or steal the bride from him; he congratulates the one he sincerely supports, and stands silent by him and with great joy in his heart listens to the voice of the groom talking with his bride.[51] Just so, I wanted nothing more than that he be acknowledged to be as mighty as he is and that I cease seeming to be greater than I am, and so I am filled with joy, knowing that all is turning out well. It must needs be that he, who till now was considered much less than he is, increase; it is only right that I, who was thought greater than I was, am diminished. It is in the interest of mankind's salvation that my reputation be overshadowed and his glory increase daily, and that my disciples defect from me and find a new home with him; compared to his power, mine is feeble and ineffectual, and my baptism is as much weaker as fire is stronger than water.[52] It is right for the earthly to give way to the heavenly, the human to the divine, the imperfect to the perfect. One who comes from the earth is earthly and speaks low and earthly things.[53] For what else can a human do but speak human things?

'But he who comes from heaven surpasses all, even the greatest of mankind. We have breathed a mere whiff of heavenly things, and we bear witness as best we can.[54] But with complete trustworthiness he bears witness among mankind to what he has seen and heard in heaven with his Father. And people marvel at me, so much lower than he; hardly anyone accepts his witness. They require the witness of me, who am his servant, about him, and they reject his witness about his Father. And yet, whoever mistrusts me mistrusts a human; whoever does not believe in him, who is the only Son, as his Father testified in his own voice,[55] makes God out a liar. The Jews worship the Father and assail the Son sent by him; but every assault on the Son falls back on the Father. So whoever accepts the witness of the Son, because he believes in the Son, affirms positively that God, who speaks in the Son, is truthful. For the Son who was sent from the Father does not speak human words but the words of God. God has also spoken through the prophets,[56] and to each one as his capacity permitted God gave a share of his Spirit; but to this his only Son God did not give his Spirit just within certain limits,[57] but poured out the entire fullness of his Spirit upon him[58] so that there is nothing the Father has that the Son lacks, and whatever the unbelief of mankind has taken from the Son the Father counts it as taken from himself.[59] For the Father uniquely loves his only Son, and has given the whole universe over into his hands,[60] not stripping himself of his own power but sharing with the Son the same might that he continues to possess. Further, whatever God has wished to grant to the human race he has wanted to bestow through his Son. But he is offering to all no ordinary thing, for he is offering eternal life, but life through him who alone is the source of eternal life. Anyone who refuses to accept this gift renders himself unfit for it. Whoever does not believe that the Son can bestow what he promises is refusing, and he is also accusing the Father of lying in making empty promises through the Son. For the reward of belief is great and the penalty of unbelief is fearful. Whoever puts his trust in the Son already possesses the Son, and whoever possesses the Son possesses eternal life. Conversely, whoever disbelieves in the Son, since he has so to speak shut his eyes to avoid looking at the light,[61] will not see life, since this light is the life of mankind; but continuing in his sins he continues in bondage to divine vengeance, that is, to everlasting death.'

Chapter 4

With such words John rebuked the excessive enthusiasm of his disciples for himself and their spiteful attitude toward Jesus, implicitly urging them to abandon him and follow Jesus, from whom everyone must seek everything. Now Jesus realized, since nothing at all ever escaped him, that a common human experience – that envy comes in glory's train[1] – had happened to him too and that the Pharisees were irritated because he was attracting more disciples and more people were streaming to his baptism than to John's. Yet Jesus himself was not baptizing, even then showing that the work of preaching is more important than baptizing;[2] the disciples were baptizing, and the Pharisees were further incensed because his disciples were claiming as much privilege for themselves as was scarcely tolerable in John, to whom the Pharisees attributed a great deal. Therefore, partly to avoid aggravating their jealousy by staying there longer as if to spite them, and partly to rehearse the coming delivery to the gentiles of the gospel grace refused by the Jews,[3] he left Judea once the elements of the gospel teaching had been sown there, and prepared to return to Galilee, from which he had come.

But now he had to pass through Samaria,[4] which had been seized long ago by godless tribes who drove out the Israelites and brought in foreigners from various places. These people, once they had been instructed by a series of afflictions from God, finally embraced some part of the religion of the Jews: they began to worship one God, though with different rituals, and they traced their ancestry back to Jacob the grandson of Abraham, because he had once lived among the Chaldeans. They accepted only the books of Moses, not the prophets. The people was named from Mount Samor. As a matter of public policy they were fiercely hated by the Jews, who never forgot the territory seized by force and the inhabitants driven out of their dwellings and the rituals that for the most part differed from their own. For the Samaritans had accepted the law of Moses without eliminating many traces of their ancient superstition.

When he came to the city of Samaria called Sychar, there was no food, for the disciples, longing only for the Lord, had not thought about provisions. To avoid offering the Jews a plausible cause for finding fault with him on the grounds that he had abandoned the Israelites and gone over to godless and wicked people (as later they called him 'Samaritan' and 'demon-possessed' by way of gross insult),[5] Jesus himself did not go into the city; he let the disciples go into town to buy food. He himself stayed there alone, partly to wait for their return and partly not to miss the chance for a miracle, since he knew what was going to happen. There was a piece of ground there that Jacob had given to his son Joseph. It was a holy place and famous among the Samaritans in remembrance of an old story, that there Levi and Simeon had avenged the rape of Dinah with a great slaughter of the inhabitants.[6] There was also a spring there, itself famous among that people because it had been dug out by Jacob, in whom, as I said, the Samaritans boast as their nation's ancestor. Jesus was tired from his long journey, which he made on foot, not on horseback or in a carriage (even then giving us an example of how a preacher of the gospel should be[7]), so he sat down in a likely spot, leaning over the spring[8] and refreshing himself in the air around it. It was about the sixth hour as the Jews figure time, when the sun approaches midday and doubles the burden of work with its heat.[9] By these signs Jesus showed that he was a true human, subject to the same physical changes as other humans.[10]

Just then a Samaritan woman came up to draw water from the well where Jesus was sitting. Jesus wished to give her a reason for talking to him and to head her towards salvation by way of the very thing she was doing,[11] so he said to her, 'Woman, give me a drink.' Now it was convenient that the disciples had gone away at this point, because Jesus was going to mention some personal matters to her that it might have seemed impertinent to talk about in front of others. Indeed, in this matter our Lord Jesus displayed for teachers of the gospel a model of courtesy and gentleness, for in his manner of address he was so far from disdaining a woman who was a sinner and who had prostituted her chastity to more than one man that he showed consideration even for a whore's modesty by providing privacy.

The woman surmised from his dress and language that Jesus was a Jew,[12] and she was well aware of how much the Jews generally shun dealings with the Samaritans, to the point of thinking themselves defiled by meeting and talking with them.[13] So in amazement both that he had spoken to her first and that he was asking for a drink, she replied, 'How is it that though you are a Jew, as I gather from your speech and dress, contrary to Jewish custom you are asking for a drink from me, a Samaritan woman, when you Jews generally shun dealings with Samaritans, and think it sinful to have any acquaintance with us?' But though Jesus was really thirsty[14] in the manner of all flesh, he did not so much thirst for[15] that water as for the salvation of souls, and therefore he gradually enticed the woman to a knowledge of the gospel grace, replying like this in a riddle, to fire further in her the desire to learn:[16] 'If you knew how excellent is the gift God is now offering to your people, and if you recognized who is now asking you for a drink, you would have asked him for one instead,[17] and he would have given you a water far mightier than this, I mean living water.' Since this remark was made about the Spirit that believers in the gospel would drink,[18] it is not surprising that a mere Samaritan woman did not understand it, when Nicodemus, both a Jew and a rabbi, was unable to follow[19] what Jesus had said rather more clearly about rebirth from above.[20] Actually he answered even more stupidly than this woman; he said, 'Surely a man cannot re-enter his mother's womb when he is old and be born anew!' But this woman guessed at something sublime from Jesus' saying 'if you knew the gift of God,' and 'if you knew who it is,' and 'he would give living water.' So she did not feel affronted that Jacob's well, which she regarded reverently, was being scorned, she did not mock the lofty talk of a man who was a stranger, unknown to her, and a Jew; instead, wanting to learn what it was that he was offering as something new and remarkable, she called him Lord[21] to show respect, because by now she had formed no low opinion of him.[22] The example of the Samaritan woman was provided by dispensation of the divine purpose to refute and put to shame the perversity of the Jews, who showed themselves so unreceptive to the Lord Jesus that they even wickedly slandered his good deeds and his teaching of salvation. Yet this mere woman replied courteously and gently to everything, so eager to be instructed that, lingering in the heat and forgetful of the reason she had come, she hung on the words of the stranger and foreigner, about whom she had never yet heard anything remarkable. 'Lord,' she said, 'you promise me better water than this. But you don't even have a jar to draw water with,[23] and the well is deep. Where then do you get the supply of living water that you promise? Surely you are not greater than our father Jacob, whom you Jews honour also? He gave us this well as a special gift and thought highly enough of the water that he himself used to drink from it, and his entire household, and his flocks.'

Jesus saw that the woman was receptive to his teaching, since she did not think that he was a magician or an enchanter[24] but some great man comparable to Jacob, for whom she had great respect. So he did not disdain to entice her little by little to a greater admiration for himself, showing her that the water he was talking about was spiritual, meant to refresh not herds but hearts. He said, 'Whoever drinks of the water that the patriarch Jacob gave to you quenches his body's thirst for only a short time; it will soon come back. But so that you understand how much the gift of God of which I spoke is greater than the gift of Jacob, and how much more excellent is the water I promise than water that bubbles out of the veins of the earth:[25] if anyone drinks of the water I will give him if he wants it, his thirst will be quenched forever; he will never again run the risk of thirst, nor will he have to seek water thereafter from some other source, but once drunk, this water will remain in him who drinks it, and it will produce in him a spring forever bubbling up to eternal life.' Jesus said this in a riddle, knowing that the woman was not yet fit for the mystery of the faith through which the Spirit is given and, once received, never fails but always forwards until it carries the person on to eternal life.

The woman's simple honesty was so great that whereas the Jews generally interpret such sayings maliciously, she, not understanding what was said but trusting and loving nonetheless, said, 'Lord, please give me some of that water, so that I will not have to come to this well again and draw water when I am thirsty.' Though this was a stupid answer, it did reveal a heart ready to believe. Since she had now formed no low opinion of Jesus, he roused her to think even more highly of him by greater proofs of his divine nature. So as if he would not like to give her a share in such a treasure without her husband's being there, he told her to fetch her husband and come back with him promptly.[26] At this, since she thought that she was only talking with a mortal, and since out of a feminine sense of shame she wanted to conceal her wrongdoing, the woman said, 'Lord, I have no husband' – thus denying a marriage but concealing her fornication. Here Jesus both declared his divine nature and gently reproved the woman's manner of living; he said, 'True enough, that you have no husband. For though you have had five men for lust, still you have had no lawful husband, and the one you have now is not your lawful husband.[27] So you told no lie about that.' When the woman realized that the misdeeds of her private life were not hidden from Jesus, a stranger and Jew, who could not know from human sources what he was telling her, she did not recoil in shame, or return insult for insult in anger;[28] she grew even more ardent in her admiration for him. And yet if Jesus had said any such thing to the Pharisees, they would have shouted, 'He is a magician, and he is possessed by a demon.'[29] But what did this godly sinner, this Samaritan woman say? 'Lord, I see you are a prophet.' The woman's belief advanced to this point: at first she only addressed him as a Jew; she was surprised that he was not very strict about the Jewish religion, because contrary to the custom of others he asked for a drink from a Samaritan. Soon she called him Lord.[30] Now she honoured him with the title of prophet, because he knew the secrets of others without having to be told.[31]

Soon, leaving aside the talk about lesser things, wanting to learn about higher matters from the prophet, she posed an apparently unanswerable question about the way to worship God, because on this point the Jews and the Samaritans had far different views. For while both nations worshipped the same God, the Jews claimed that God was to be worshipped nowhere except in the temple at Jerusalem, as if he would not hear the prayers of the faithful anywhere else. Conversely, the Samaritans by a like but conflicting superstition, said that God was to be worshipped nowhere except on Mount Gerizim, because that was the place decreed by Moses where the patriarchs were to bless the people who keep God's commandments.[32] So since each nation took pleasure in its own rituals and despised the religion of the other, the woman wanted to find out from one she supposed a prophet and versed in such things which people's form of worship was holier, so she could follow what she learned was the better way. So she said, 'Our forefathers used to worship on this mountain, and they thought it wrong to worship God anywhere else. But you Jews think that sacrificing on hilltops and in groves[33] is detestable and that it is wrong to worship God anywhere but in the temple at Jerusalem, and they[34] take pride in the temple as if God were shut up in a building made by human hands.'[35]

Since the woman's question had to do with learning true religion, Jesus disclosed to her that once the true spiritual worship of God had been set forth through the gospel teaching, then the gentiles' superstitious worship of gods and demons would be brought to an end. The Samaritans' form of worship would also be ended, for they did not have a correct understanding of God, but believed that he was a kind of chief demon, and they combined demon worship with worship of him,[36] mixing the unholy superstition of the gentiles with the worship of God as if mixing fire with water,[37] and conducting their ceremonies in groves and on hilltops as the gentiles did. The religion of the Jews, which as befitted its circumstances had been coarse and unspiritual till then, and possessed only shadows[38] of true godliness rather than godliness itself, would advance to a better state. Then God, more fully known through the Son and the Holy Spirit, would be worshipped not only in Judea but in the entire world, and in holier temples than the one at Jerusalem, that is, in the pure hearts of humankind, which God would have sanctified for himself by his own Spirit; and he would be won over not by the aroma of burnt offerings but by devout prayers, godly vows, pure affections.[39]

But before Jesus disclosed this mystery of the gospel religion, he started with faith, without which no one is a fit hearer of the gospel teaching or a fit practiser of the gospel worship. For faith alone purifies hearts[40] and makes them fit to be entrusted with the secrets of the heavenly philosophy.

'Woman,' he said, 'have faith in me, if you really think I am a prophet: now is the time when the corrupt worship of the Samaritans will be ended and the unspiritual religion of the Jews will be changed for the better. In the future you will worship the Father neither on this mountain (for he is not the God of this mountain only but of the whole world) nor in Jerusalem. But wherever devout people gather there will be Jerusalem. At present we excel you in so far as we worship God as he is known in the law and we proclaim him Lord of all things and all peoples, and we do not stain the worship of the one who alone is to be worshipped with the worship of other gods.[41] You worship what you do not know, thinking that God is only the God of the Jews and yourselves, and that he is the sort to share his privileges with demons, though in fact divine honours should be paid only to him. The law has taught the Jews this, and the temple for the worship of the one God was built at Jerusalem at his own direction, to be a model of the spiritual temple. Priests were appointed, and rituals for sacrifices, foreshadowing in their outlines the gospel religion. So we excel you in having a better understanding of God than yours, in not staining his worship with the worship of the gentiles' gods, and in worshipping him in the place he directed, by the rites he gave us. Yet this present form of religion, though not perfect, is a step on the way to perfect religion. That is why the beginning of salvation has come from the Jews, who through the prophets have the promise of the messiah to come and through the law have the shadowy outlines of the gospel religion.[42] Now it is time for the false religion of the gentiles to give way, and for unspiritual worship to yield to spiritual, and the shadow of the law to yield to the light of the gospel.

'For now, I say, the time is near, or rather has already come, when the true worshippers will worship the Father not in temples, not in sacrifices, not in material objects, but in spirit, not in shadows but in truth. For since God is spirit he takes no pleasure in physical purity or temple walls or burnt offerings, but loves spiritual worshippers who worship him in spirit and in truth.[43] This present time is the limit set to the shadows and outlines of the law of Moses. From now on, wherever there is a mind cleansed from sin through the gospel faith, there will be a temple worthy of God; wherever there are heavenly vows, pure prayers, holy meditations, there will be the offerings by which God is propitiated.'

The woman's open and willing inclination to believe was so far advanced by Jesus' words that she now suspected that he whom she had called Jew, then Lord, then prophet, was actually the messiah.[44] For because of Moses' promises the Samaritans also were waiting for that outstanding prophet to come from the Jews.[45] So she replied, 'I know that a messiah will come,[46] whom the Jews are waiting for, and there is already some talk among them about him. When he comes he will explain to us all this that you said about the new worship of God, and will not allow us to be ignorant of any of it.' Jesus saw the woman's readiness to be taught about the faith and her burning eagerness to learn the truth, the like of which he had not found among his own people, the Jews, and thought it right to reveal to her who he was. 'You are waiting for a messiah to come,' he said; 'know that he has already come, and you are looking at him, for I, the one speaking to you, am he.'

As he said this the disciples were coming up, returning from the town. Before they got near they caught sight of him talking with a Samaritan woman, and they were amazed at his great humanity.[47] But no one presumed to ask him what he wanted from the woman or why he had spoken to her.

Then the woman, dumbstruck at the Lord Jesus' words, did not reply but left her water-jar at the well – for her thirst for water had vanished now that she had tasted the water that Christ promised – and hurried into the city. And in an instant she turned from a Samaritan sinner into an apostle,[48] telling the story to everyone she met, and in this way she strengthened her own faith by sharing it with others. 'Come and see a marvellous man,' she said, 'one who knows hidden things, for though he is a stranger and I never saw him before, he told me all the secret things I have done. Perhaps he is the messiah. Don't take my word for it, come and see for yourselves, and you will find that I am not being foolish.'[49]

While the woman was spreading the news among the citizens of Sychar, the disciples, supposing that Jesus was tormented[50] with hunger, invited him to eat the food they had brought. But Jesus was always seizing upon opportunities for bringing people away from worry about material things to eagerness for spiritual things.[51] Just as he had led the woman from the mention of water to a knowledge of the gospel faith, he likewise drew the still untrained disciples from the circumstance of food to eagerness for spreading the gospel. In the earlier instance perhaps he was not thirsty for well-water;[52] and if he was thirsty, he thirsted more for the salvation of mankind; nonetheless, he took the opportunity for a holy conversation from the feelings of a woman who had come to draw water. Similarly now, though he was hungry in the manner of all flesh, he had a greater hunger to save the human race, for whose sake he had come from heaven. So when the disciples urged him to restore his body's strength, he said, 'I have another food to eat, and it is dearer to me than what you bring.' The disciples wondered what this meant, but not daring to ask out of respect for their teacher, lest he be offended, they talked among themselves: 'What does this mean? Did someone else bring him food while we were gone?' But to fix the puzzling remark he had just made firmly in their minds, Jesus spoke more directly. 'Food for the body,' he said, 'moves me very little; there is another food which is my chief concern: that I accomplish the purpose for which the heavenly Father sent me here. This is my hunger and my thirst: to fulfil his command. Time is pressing, and the hearts of mankind, inclining towards the gospel faith, call out for the work of preachers.

'If you who spend your energies on material concerns know that harvest time is near when four months have passed since the sowing, how much more ought we not neglect the time of our spiritual harvest? When the grain turns yellow it seems itself to call out for the sickle and the labour of the reapers; just so, if you raise your eyes and see the crop of human hearts, even among Samaritans and gentiles, hurrying towards the gospel teaching, you will understand that everywhere plains are ripening for the gospel harvest and calling out for our labour and energies. But if hope of a good yield summons the reaper readily to his work, how much more should we be quick to gather this harvest for the Father, which will yield for the reaper a rich reward in heaven and will gather for God not wheat into the granaries but human souls into eternal life? And it will turn out that both sower and reaper will rejoice equally. You are familiar with the truth of the well-known proverb "One is the sower, another the reaper."[53] There is more sweat in sowing than in reaping. The ground must be given its first plowing, the clumps must be broken up with mattock and hoe, the field fertilized with manure, the seed sown, harrowed, and covered, the weeds must be pulled out. But when the crop is grown, it is cut without much trouble, and the yield already assured lightens the strain of toil. But the spiritual harvest is different from the earthly one. For in the latter, when according to the proverb the yield of the harvest goes to someone other than the sower, the reaper rejoices but the sower is in torment.[54] Conversely with the spiritual harvest: the sower and the reaper rejoice together, for neither is without the fruits of his labour. I have sent you to reap a crop in which you have not laboured. The efforts of the prophets made the first plowing, and their teaching readied a yet uncultivated world for the gospel.[55] You now follow on their efforts, and take over a task well begun, for the world of its own accord now offers itself to the heavenly teaching and mortals are even trying to break into the kingdom of heaven by force.'[56]

While our Lord Jesus urged his disciples to the work of the gospel with talk of this kind, the very facts of the case showed[57] that what he said about the ripening harvest was true. For in the city many Samaritans had believed that the messiah had come, though the woman had only offered as evidence the fact that he had disclosed to her the shameful secrets of her life.[58] They had not heard him speaking himself or seen any miracles done by him. Even a people who seemed hostile to the promises of the prophets were so inclined to believe! Hence a crowd of Samaritans came running out of the city to see with their own eyes the man of whom the woman had told them with so much feeling. And his presence did not disappoint their expectation; they were not put off by his simple dress or his small band of poor and ordinary disciples. Yet the Jews, though they had seen so many miracles, heard so many conversations, had so many kindnesses bestowed on them, still slandered him, insulted him, or stoned him. What is more, on the word of a mere woman the Samaritans ran to meet him, a man not of their race, whom they had never heard speak, whom they had never seen do anything remarkable, and they earnestly invited him to consent to take advantage of their city's hospitality. What did most merciful Jesus do then? He knew the jealousy of the Jews, he knew their hatred for the Samaritans. It was not yet time for the Jews to be rejected because of their insuperable unbelief and for the preaching of the gospel to find a new home among the gentiles.[59] Therefore he managed the business in such a way that he did not give his own people, by some easily misunderstood act, the opportunity to complain that he had scorned them and had preferred Samaritans to them even though prophecy promised that the messiah would come to the Jews;[60] nor did he at all fail the Samaritans' devout belief. For his journey through Samaria was a matter of necessity; but it was a matter of his humaneness[61] that when invited he stayed with them for two days at least, and no one could rightly find fault with it.

When they had listened to Jesus, many more in the city believed, and those who had formed a high opinion of him from the woman's words had their belief strengthened. They gave ample testimony, worthy of a real Jew,[62] about Jesus, saying to the woman, 'You spoke about him with more restraint than the case requires. Now we do not believe that he is the messiah[63] because we were influenced by your words, but we ourselves are sure from the wonderful things he has to say that he really is the messiah the Jews are waiting for, who will bring salvation not just to the Jewish race but to the whole world.' With this prompt and complete testimony the Samaritans both made plain their own belief and exposed the wicked unbelief of the Jews.

To avoid giving the Jews material for more hatred and envy, Jesus did no miracles among the Samaritans, and only stayed there as a guest by chance and when he was invited. He enjoyed their hospitality for only two days, then soon resumed his journey and went into Galilee. Though the place where he had been brought up[64] was on his way, he did not turn off in that direction, not because he scorned it, but because he had no hope of any gain for the gospel on account of the scorn and unbelief of his own people, to whom he was known or related according to the flesh. Preaching would have doubled the accusation of unbelief against them; as it was, they incurred a lesser guilt for not believing in Jesus' teaching.[65] Further, when the Lord was asked why he did not go to his own people to show them how great he was, he used that well-worn proverb of everyday speech: 'A prophet is not without honour except in his own country and among his relatives.'[66] For the disposition of mankind is such that familiarity breeds contempt,[67] and most things are only valued because they come from far away. But a quite respectable report had already been spread about him in Galilee, because of John's testimony and the miracle he himself had recently performed there. So when he arrived the Galileans welcomed him, particularly because they had seen him at Jerusalem, throwing the tradesmen out of the temple, and the other things he had done there before the people with great authority. For these Galileans had gone to Jerusalem for the festival also.

All of this, of course, condemned the unbelief of the Pharisees and rehearsed the coming transfer of the gospel grace to the gentiles. The Samaritans believed because of the preaching of a mere woman, they took a foreigner in to enjoy their hospitality, they proclaimed him to be the messiah and the liberator of the world; and yet Jesus had not honoured them with a single miracle. The Galileans, a dull-witted nation not learned in the law, who had never produced a prophet, saw his miracles and began to believe. Those in Jerusalem, priests, Pharisees, and scribes, who appeared to possess the height of religiosity and who were unsurpassed in knowledge of the law, obstinately found fault with both his actions and his words.[68] So the more righteous and pious each one thought himself, the further he was from the gospel religion; and the further, by human standards, anyone was from the understanding of the law and the prophets that promised Christ, and the more removed from the accepted religion, the more disposed in fact he was towards the Christ that the law had promised, and the more fit for the gospel teaching.

So Jesus entered Galilee, and went to Cana of Galilee, where some days earlier he had turned water into wine. That miracle, initially known to only a few and later spread about by people's talk, had earned Jesus a degree of good reputation, though not corresponding to what he deserved. Very few believed that he was the messiah; most thought he was a prophet. So Jesus went back to Cana, not hunting for praise from the miracle he had done there but so that he might now reap something from what he had secretly sown.[69] For this was what he thirsted for, that people's faith be worthy of the gospel.

Here again material developed for reproaching the Jews with their unbelief. At that time there was a ruler in Galilee, a civil official in the imperial service, not a Jew or a Samaritan but a gentile, and a stranger to the entire religion of the Jews.[70] He had a son of whom he was unusually fond, who was dangerously ill in the city of Capernaum. When this man heard that Jesus had left Judea and returned to Galilee, leaving his son at home, he himself set out from Capernaum, and coming to Jesus begged him earnestly to go back to Capernaum with him and heal his son. For the disease was too severe for the sufferer to be brought to Jesus; he had already begun to fail when the ruler was leaving. Jesus showed that the ruler's faith was still imperfect, since he did not yet believe that his son could be healed unless Jesus went there, as if he were calling in a doctor, or as if Jesus could not restore life even to the dead;[71] but more than that, Jesus reproved the unbelief of certain Jews who did not believe even when they saw miracles. He said to the ruler, 'The confidence of those who believe in my mere words alone, unsupported by miracles, is very pleasing to me.[72] You people do not believe in me unless you see signs and wonders.'

Entirely intent as he was on the danger to his dying son, the ruler did not reply to this remark of our Lord Jesus, because he thought that such talk was a waste of time, while the illness demanded an immediate cure. So he urged Jesus to hurry and come to Capernaum before his son died, as though it would be useless for him to come once the son had breathed his last. Yet it was no more difficult for Jesus to call back a soul already gone from the body than to keep it in the body when it was preparing to depart. Without reproaching the ruler's faith,[73] Jesus demonstrated in action that he was far more powerful than the man thought he was. 'There is no need,' he said, 'for me to go to Capernaum for this. Go home; the son you left dying is now alive and well.' The ruler's faith was somewhat encouraged at these words, for, relying on what Jesus had said, he hurried home. And while he was still on his way there, slaves came running to meet him, to report to the father cheering news about the son, that though he had just been at death's door he had suddenly rallied; they said that the father should not trouble Jesus, whose help was not necessary. For they supposed that the boy had improved by some chance, not knowing what had happened between the ruler and Jesus. But here the ruler's uncertainty, mixed with trust, gave credence to the miracle. For wanting to know whether his son had rallied by chance or because of Jesus' power, he asked the servants at what time his son had begun to improve. They said, 'Yesterday at the seventh hour the fever suddenly left him, and instantly he was stronger.' The father realized that this was the hour when Jesus had said to him, 'Go home, your son lives.' Now he was sure that the boy had revived not by chance but by Jesus' power. And this miracle, though invested in a gentile, was not without its fruits. For not only did the ruler himself believe that Christ was the messiah, but at his urging and example, his whole household also believed, and it necessarily was a large and numerous one, since it belonged to a rich man and a public official. Yet among his own people and his relatives Jesus had gained only a very few for the gospel, though he had done many miracles.

Jesus, then, did this second sign when he returned from Judea to Galilee, to confirm the earlier miracle he had done in Cana by another greater one, and to summon his own people to faith by the example of a gentile, even then, whenever the opportunity offered, rehearsing, as it were, the rejection of the Jews on account of their unbelief and the reception of the gentiles to the gospel grace through faith.

Chapter 5

Once these foundations were laid among the Samaritans and Galileans, Jesus went to Jerusalem again near the festival of Pentecost,[1] intending, because of the throng, to make his authority known to more people, and to rebuke the unbelief of the Pharisees, who were swollen with the false conviction of their own sanctity and knowledge, yet were so greatly surpassed by Samaritans and gentiles.[2]

Now at Jerusalem there was a pool or reservoir called Probatica in Greek, from 'cattle,' because there the priests customarily washed the sacrificial victims, and for the same reason called Bethesda in Hebrew, that is, 'stock-barn.'[3] The reservoir has five colonnades attached to it. In the colonnades lay a great number of people suffering from various diseases, and also very many blind, lame, and maimed people, waiting for the water to be stirred up. For at set times the angel of the Lord came down into the pool and the water was moved.[4] The first person who went into the pool after the angel's stirring of the water was freed from whatever disease or bodily defect afflicted him. (This was even then a symbol of baptism,[5] by which the dirt and disease of the soul, however damning, are once and for all washed away, whenever the action of the baptizer and the divine power from heaven are joined to the element of water.) Without a doubt, this was the reason why there was then a huge throng of people there who had come just to see the sight, or who had the care of the sick who lay in the five colonnades.

So that the miracle would be more striking, out of all of these Jesus chose one, the most hopeless of all, because he had a dangerous illness, all but incurable, and had had it for a long time, and because he was most in need of someone else's assistance; the sick man was so poor that he was unable to hire anyone to carry him into the water quickly enough. (No one out of that whole crowd would be cured except the one who was lucky enough to get into the water first.) This man's misfortune would contribute to the greatness of the miracle and his faith served as an example. Indeed, he had borne with the paralysis for thirty years,[6] to teach us that there is no sickness of soul so damning and of such long standing that baptism and faith in Jesus does not easily take it away. So when the most merciful Jesus saw this paralytic whom everyone thought hopeless lying there with his limbs useless from disease, and when he realized that his wretchedness was the more hopeless because it had kept him in misery for thirty whole years, touched by pity he said to him, 'Do you want to be healed?' He clearly meant to show to the bystanders the man's faith and endurance,[7] and also to make the strength of the disease plain to all, as well as suggest that no one can be cured of defects of the soul unless he hates his disease and is possessed by the desire for healing.[8] For there was no doubt that the man wished to be cured, since he had sat by the pool in steadfast hope of healing for so many years, and had not given up hope though he had been disappointed so many times.

The paralytic did not reply to Jesus' question; yet, deriving some hope from the prompt inquiry, he showed that he had the will and that he was confident, regardless of the extent and duration of his illness, that if he were carried into the pool he could be cured. He said that he lacked the assistance of a porter to move him quickly into the pool as soon as the water was stirred up. For when the others realized that the pool was moving, he said, each hurried as best he could to be the first to go in and thus be the one to carry off the gift of healing; but he himself, slow because of his illness and without a porter, crept towards the reservoir, already in vain since someone else had gone in before him. The paralytic's words were leading up to a respectful request that Jesus, who was himself healthy and, as appeared from his addressing the sick man, compassionate, would when it was time carry him down to the pool.[9] Indeed, he did not dare ask it directly, but he was hinting, by explaining his situation, what the obstacle to his healing was. For the sick man did not know Jesus. But Jesus was delighted with the man's endurance, because he did not do what many unfortunate people do, and protest loudly, or wish himself dead, or curse the day on which he was born.[10] Nor did he take offence at Jesus' asking him whether he wanted to be cured and shout out that Jesus was making fun of him. At the same time the Lord was moved by such a steadfast hope of receiving healing, and wanted to show that even those who were cured by the disturbance of the pool were cured by his power, and that he had at hand the power to take away all diseases of both body and soul with just a nod. So he said to the man, 'Rise, take up your bed, and walk.' No sooner had he spoken than the man was cured; not merely was he free from his illness though otherwise weak and helpless, as those who are cured by doctors' skills usually are, but without anyone's assistance he got up onto his feet, lifted his pallet onto his shoulders, and in this way a sturdy porter of his own bed, walked off and went home, a reminder to all who saw him of his long-standing illness.[11]

But it was the Sabbath when the paralytic did this, and for that reason the Pharisees had a breeding ground for slander. They superstitiously kept the parts of the law that were unspiritual and given only for a short time, neglecting the parts that were important and meant to last forever. In their view it was criminal to have broken the Sabbath rest, but to have cheated one's neighbour on the Sabbath was of no significance. They wanted it to seem sinful to have picked up a pallet on the Sabbath; they saw no blame in begrudging a wretched man his cure. They knew the paralytic, they knew he had been bedridden for many years; it was agreed that he was now well and showed no trace of illness. For such a great miracle they ought to have glorified God and congratulated the man who had been cured, if they had not been truly sinful towards God and envious of their neighbour. So these perversely devout men attacked him because he had picked up his bed, and reproached him. 'It is the Sabbath,' they said, 'and our duty to it is to rest. It is wrong for you to pick up your bed.'

The man did not conceal the benefit he had received,[12] and deflected the ill will of the charge from himself by appealing to the authority of Jesus, indicating that he who was able to perform so great an act with a word seemed to be at once more than human and greater than the Sabbath.[13] He replied to the faultfinding of the Jews, 'He who cured me with just a word ordered me to take up my bed and walk.' When they heard this, though they should now have believed because of the miracle, they not only were jealous of the man who had been cured but even devised a trap for the one who had caused the restoration of his health. 'Who is the man,' they said, 'who told you to take up your bed and walk?' For they wanted to fix the charge of violating the Sabbath on him, as they did more than once on other occasions. But the man who had been cured did not know Jesus by name, he could only recognize him by appearance; at that moment he could not even point him out, because as soon as Jesus had spoken to the paralytic, he had withdrawn from the crowd, partly not to aggravate the envy of the Jews by his presence, partly so that in his absence the miracle would become known with greater certainty from him who had felt the benefit of health.[14]

Then when the miracle had been made known and disclosed, Jesus wanted its author to be known as well. When he met the man on whom he had bestowed the benefit of health,[15] he said to him, 'Look, you have gotten good health; with the removal of the disease of your body, which arose from the disease of your soul,[16] I have taken away both ills. Be careful not to fall back into your earlier sins and call down upon yourself some worse evil.' The man who had received his health recognized that the same person who earlier had ordered him to take up his bed now, giving evidence that he was the cause of his health, advised him not to repeat his sins and fall back into some worse illness; and he learned that his name was Jesus. So he went to the Jews who were finding fault with him and pointed out that it was Jesus to whom he owed his health, thinking that it was important to many that a man who could thus heal a hopeless illness with a word be well known to everyone.[17]

Here too the damnable perversity of the Jews betrayed itself. For the Samaritans had welcomed Jesus with honour on the testimony of a mere woman; the Galileans, though they had a bad reputation among the majority of Jews for their inferior birth and their ignorance of the law, had believed in him as the Christ; a gentile ruler, on the basis of a single miracle, had with his whole household proclaimed Jesus as the saviour of the world.[18] But the citizens of Jerusalem, swollen with pride in the fame of their city and in the sanctity of their temple, and advertising themselves for their expertise in the law, devised slander against Jesus with such determined maliciousness that though the benefit of health was too plain to be denied and too holy to be disapproved (for what is holier than freely to give physical healing to an unfortunate person?), they charged Christ with ignoring the Sabbath and ordering the bed to be picked up – as if mankind were made for the Sabbath instead of the Sabbath being invented for mankind;[19] or as if the ceremonies of the law should not everywhere give way to holier commandments and duties. What blindness, to be angry at Jesus because he had cured a pitiable man on the Sabbath, while they themselves, who thought themselves scrupulous adherents of the law, did not fear to help a donkey that had fallen into a well on the Sabbath! They slanderously claim that in the assistance given to a human, offence is offered to God, without whose help no human can be healed, but they do not consider that the Sabbath observance is broken in assisting a donkey.[20] This is the perverted religion of the Jews, who embrace the appearance of religion and thus subvert the source of true religion, clinging tenaciously to the shadows of the law and stubbornly persecuting him for whose sake the law was written. For they not only slandered Jesus, they persecuted him,[21] and for no other reason than that he had performed a holy and pious act on the Sabbath.

But Jesus intended to show that he was the Lord of the Sabbath,[22] not its slave, its creator, not its subject, and at the same time to make plain that the Jews' slander, which they fixed on the Son when he was acting on the authority of the Father, fell back on the Father himself. So he tried to blunt their slander in these words: 'My heavenly Father,' he said, 'whose scrupulous worshippers you want to appear to be, and who created the Sabbath for you, when he created the world in six days and rested on the seventh from his work, did not so bind himself to rest that he could not do what he wanted whenever he thought best. For though his Sabbath still endures, nonetheless he does not cease from the work of governing all that he has made, bringing forth one thing after another, restoring what has fallen down.[23] Therefore, just as he does not stop doing good for mortals and all created things every day merely to observe the Sabbath, on which he is said to have rested from the creation of the world, so I, who am his Son, having from him both the power and the example of doing the things that make for the welfare of the human race, am not prevented by the Sabbath observance from carrying out what my Father commanded. But if you condemn me for breaking the Sabbath, you are in the same act condemning my Father, who is both the example and the source for these deeds. Or if you absolve him and glorify him because the health of a wretched man has been restored, why do you charge me with breaking the Sabbath, instead of recognizing a power greater than observance of the Sabbath? I have restored life to a sufferer; you are scheming death for me because of so great a good deed.'

The rage of the Jews was so far from being soothed by these blessed words of Jesus that, more angered than ever, they were in an uproar against him, grasping for an opportunity to kill him, because now he had not only broken the Sabbath but was laying claim to God as his own father, making himself equal to him in works and in the authority to do what he wanted. But our Lord Jesus, though he understood their wickedness, continued to deter them from their sinful cruelty by more clearly revealing the power he had received from God the Father. He so arranged his words[24] that sometimes he spoke of higher things, working in the divine nature that he shared with the Father; sometimes mixing in lower things[25] that bore witness to his human nature, so that if the human relationship did not lure them to love, the majesty of divine power would surely restrain them from their wicked rashness. But he made his claim to a sharing of power with the Father in such a way that he yielded to the Father's supremacy.[26] He spoke as follows: 'You are amazed that I have claimed a partnership of works with the Father. But I affirm to you most emphatically, the Son, who is entirely dependent on the Father, can do nothing of himself, since he does not exist of himself, but what he has seen the Father do, he himself does also. Indeed, the will and the power are identical, but supremacy resides with the Father, and whatever the Son is or can do comes to the Son from him. Thus whatever the Father does, equally the Son also performs the same thing, because of the equality of power shared through his sonship. Among mortals children are often worse than their parents;[27] and the will of father and son is not always identical, nor is the capability. Here the case is otherwise. For the Father uniquely loves the Son, and has made his Son most like himself, and has infused an equal power of action into him, and shows that everything that he himself does is to be done by the Son. The example comes from the Father, but the doing is common to both. He created the world, and he governs the world even on the Sabbath; he created humankind, and he preserves humankind even on the Sabbath. So whoever slanders the works of the Son insults the Father. What you see me doing on the Sabbath I do on my Father's authority and instruction.

'Perhaps it seems marvellous and greater than human powers to restore health to a paralytic with a word. But the Father, on whose instruction the Son does everything that he does, will make known that he has shown his Son even greater works for you to marvel at still more. For it is a much mightier thing to waken the dead to life than to restore health to a sick man. And the Father has given this power also to the Son. Moreover, he gave it to be the Son's own forever, so that as the Father rouses the dead with only a nod and recalls them to life, so the Son also, with the same power, may recall to life whomever he wishes. For whatever the Father does, he does through the Son; whatever the Son does, he does by the will of the Father. For the will of the Father and the Son is identical, just as their power is identical. The highest and especial authority of God is to judge the world; for he is king and lord of all.[28] Yet he has bestowed this entire power also on the Son, to whom he gave every right of judging everything in the heavens, everything on the earth, everything below the earth.[29] Just as the Father created all things through the Son, governs all things through the Son, restores all things through the Son, likewise he judges only through the Son, so that each illumines and adorns the other.

'The Father becomes known through the Son, through whom he works; the Son in turn declares the majesty of the Father, from whom he possesses all his own works, so that, each being known through the other, all may honour the Son as they honour the Father. For it is right that the ones who share power and will also share honour. Do not think that the Father is well disposed towards you if you are opposed to the Son. Whoever honours the Father working in the Son also honours the Son working by the Father's authority. But whoever does not honour the Son, most dear and most like to the Father, also does not honour the Father, who has sent his Son that through him he may be honoured. For there is nothing that is not shared between them, whether honour or disgrace.

'He who distrusts the Son also distrusts the Father, by whom the Son was sent into the world, and by whose will and instruction he does whatever he does, and through him[30] the Father speaks to the world. Just as the believer's reward will not be modest, so the unbeliever's penalty will not be light. For I tell you assuredly, whoever hears my words and believes in him who sent me and speaks through me, already has eternal life.[31] For whoever is forgiven his sins and through righteousness lives for God, possesses God and possesses eternal life, and he will not need to fear the sentence of eternal death that awaits unbelievers, or rather that already holds unbelievers in its grasp. But freed from his earlier sins, by faith he moves his dwelling from death to life. It is a greater thing to recall to life a soul dead from sin than to restore a deceased body to life. But the Father has given the Son the power to do both. Be very sure that the time is near, or rather is already here, when the dead also will hear the voice of the Son of God, and those who hear it will live. For as if awakened from sleep they will come forth from the tombs, and to your amazement will make plain that they truly live. Likewise do dead souls live again if they hear the voice of the Son of God. But he who hears without trusting does not hear. Some day the bodies of all the dead will live again at the call of the Son of God. At present a sign of the coming resurrection has been given in the calling of a few mortals back to life;[32] in this action a greater matter is enacted, that at his call souls live again. As nothing is more precious than life, so nothing is more divine than to give life, or to restore it.

'There is no reason for anyone to distrust the power of the Son if he has trust in the Father's power. No one doubts that God is the source of all life, from whom life flows to all in heaven or earth. But as the Father in himself has life in himself to grant or restore to whomever he wishes, so he has given it also to the Son, so that the Son has the source of all life in himself, and he has also given the Son the authority to judge the living and the dead.[33] For by his inexorable decision those who obey the Son's teaching will be carried over into eternal life; those who refuse to obey will be condemned to eternal punishment. Do not wonder that so much power has been granted to a man, for that man is also the Son of God.[34] What was given him was what he has always shared with the Father. Now see to it that through believing you are worthy of life. The time will surely come when all who are dead and buried hear the almighty voice of the Son of God, and their bodies will live again at that moment; and those who have died and been laid in the ground will come forth from the secret places of the earth to take their share of the various rewards of belief or unbelief. For those who did good here will live again to inherit immortal life; likewise, those who committed evil will live again to the eternal punishment of death. Unbelief is the source of all evil, as faith is the source of all good.[35]

'And there is no reason for anyone to find fault with the Son's judgment as unfair. If the Father's judgment cannot be unfair, then neither can the Son's judgment be unfair, since it is identical with the Father's. And the Son makes no judgment except as the Father has instructed. Whoever fears the judgment of the Father ought to fear the Son's judgment also. I cannot do anything of myself. As I am told by the Father, so I judge, and therefore my judgment is just, because other than my Father's will I have no will that might be somehow corrupted and bring forth corrupt judgment.

'Among humankind there is little trust in one who bears witness to himself, and one who claims great things for himself by his own assertions is considered presumptuous. If I alone am witness for myself, my testimony would mean little to you.[36] But there is one who has borne witness about me, to whom you have attributed much in other matters, but on this point, inconsistently, you do not believe him, though I know his testimony is true because he offered it not on his own but by the inspiration of the Father. You cannot deny that John's testimony has little weight with you. You yourselves sent important men to him as if to discover through reliable persons from a very reliable source whether he was the messiah. He did not claim for himself the false honour that you wanted to attribute to him, but he proclaimed the truth, openly bearing witness that he was not the one he was thought to be, but that I am the messiah who takes away the sins of the world and gives the world life. Certainly the witness of a man to whom you attributed so much that you believed he was the messiah ought to carry weight with you, especially since it was not prearranged by me but solicited by you yourselves.

'As for myself, I have no need to be recommended by human testimony. I repeat to you John's testimony about me not so that I may become more highly regarded by you, for I am indifferent to human glory, but so that you, with whom John's authority is so great, may believe in the one about whom he bore witness, avoid being found guilty of unbelief, and through believing achieve salvation. John was indeed great, but he was not that promised light of the world; he was only a lamp burning from our fire, giving light from our light.[37] And though on his evidence you ought to have hastened toward the true light[38] that gives light always to every human who comes into this world, you preferred to glory in his light for a little while rather than embrace the true light that bestows unending glory and never dims or sets. He shone like the morning star, soon to give way to the sun and be dimmed by the brilliance of the true light.[39] You wanted him to be the messiah, and he said that he was not worthy to untie the straps of the messiah's sandals.[40] Then why does the witness that he bore about me now mean so little to you when you thought so grandly of him otherwise? I am not dependent on John's testimony, but I would wish it had weight with you, so that you do not perish on account of your unbelief.

'Yet if you do not trust his testimony, I have of myself a surer testimony, the testimony of my Father, who is greater than John,[41] and whose testimony cannot be refuted. There is no testimony more certain than my deeds themselves. If you see that they are worthy of God, if you see that they are done by me, they bear me sufficient witness that I do nothing of myself but on the authority of him who sent me into the world for your salvation's sake. Therefore there is no reason for you to excuse your unbelief and make light of my trustworthiness on the ground that I am my only witness and assert great things about myself. You have John's witness, very weighty with you, though he has greater need of my testimony not to seem to have testified falsely. You have the witness of my deeds, so that it is not necessary now to believe anyone's words when you see the deeds themselves.[42]

'But if even this is insufficient for your unbelief, at the Jordan you heard the voice of the Father from on high bearing witness about me. Because the Father is spirit[43] he has neither a voice that can be heard with human ears nor a shape that can be seen with physical eyes. For he was not seen and heard by Moses as he really is in his own nature, as you suppose. He is seen and heard in that fashion only by the Son, and yet he did penetrate your senses with some voice and some shape. He spoke to the prophets and through the prophets he has spoken to you; he spoke to John, and through John to you; but he spoke to me as he really is in his own nature, and through me he speaks to you. But if you do not deny that John's testimony was openly given, why do you not believe it? If you think God truly spoke and appeared to Moses and the prophets, why do you not believe the things he said through them?[44] Of course you believe that the Scriptures came from God, and yet while you busy yourselves[45] in close study of them and you locate the hope and happiness of life in them, you do not believe the Scriptures on the one thing that is the chief point of all, just as you refused to trust John when he bore witness about me, though you attributed much to him in other matters. For the Scriptures promise life, but through me. In them the Father bears witness to me and promises that he will send his Son, through whom salvation is to be given to mortals. But just as you heard John and do not believe, as you heard the voice of the Father and do not believe, so the witness of the law and the prophets does not stay fast in your minds.[46] Though you always have the books in your hands, the words in your mouths, you still reject him whom those writings promise, you do not believe in him whom the Father sent in accordance with the promise of the prophets. Though there is no path to life except through me, confirmed as I am by so many witnesses, nonetheless you despise them all and refuse to come to me, where with the least trouble you may have life. For the doorway[47] of salvation is to have believed in the Son whom the Father sent.

'There is no need for me to hunt for human glory[48] among you through the witness of John or the prophets; but I am grieved at your destruction, for by your unbelief you begrudge yourselves eternal life. At the same time I take every excuse away from you if you do not believe. I have offered so many pieces of evidence, to which otherwise you attribute the greatest weight; in my case alone, for whose sake all of them were written and spoken, you do not accept them. You make a show of your worship and love of God; you revere the prophets through whom he spoke; yet you scorn God's promised one, who declares who he is by his works. This is the evidence that you worship God in false religion, and that you do not truly love God, whom the law commands you to love with all your soul and all your strength,[49] because you despise his Son. So your unbelief is not from a lack of witnesses, but from a lack of true love for God. You love human glory, you love money, you love pleasure, and in addition you employ a false appearance of religion to a bad end. What is more, you persecute the Son of God because the things he teaches are contrary to your debased lusts, though they are in accord with the Father's will.

'All this proves that you do not sincerely love the Father. For whoever loves him believes in and obeys him, and whoever loves the Father cannot hate his most dear Son, and whoever loves the one who appoints a deputy cannot spurn the deputy, especially since I do not desire either glory or kingship or wealth among mankind; I desire only the Father's glory, and I desire it so that you may be saved. You see deeds worthy of God, yet I do not claim mankind's praise for myself but for the Father, to whom belong the deeds done through me. Though you want to seem to worship the Father scrupulously, you do not accept[50] me, though I have come in his name and do nothing other than what he has instructed. And perversely not believing in me as you do, though I come in the name of the Father and freely offer you life and salvation, you will likewise be foolishly credulous of anyone who, coming in his own name, appropriating God's glory for himself and doing his own business, not God's, offers you what will draw you into eternal death.[51] If God is dear to you, why do you clamour against one who seeks God's glory? If you love eternal life, why do you reject the source of life? If one who claims God's glory for himself is sinful, why do you accept one who appropriates it falsely? Then what is left except to admit that your devotion to God is counterfeit? You worship God in words, in dress, in rituals; in truth you hate him.[52] In your mouth is "the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord";[53] in your heart is money. In your mouth are the law and the prophets; in your heart is lust for human praise. In your mouth are the words of the law: "You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and your neighbour as yourself";[54] in your heart is malice and hatred and murder. True praise is to have earned praise with God. True godliness is to ascribe all glory to God.

'Then how can you believe in me, the preacher of nothing but the glory of God, when you scorn the true glory that comes from God and chase after[55] false glory among humankind, fawning on each other by turns and begrudging God his glory, snatching at the false appearance of religion before humans and scorning the clear conscience that God sees? In chasing after the filthy profits of this world, you lose eternal life. So it is no wonder if God is angry with you, since you oppose him so stubbornly.

'Do not suppose that I am eager to avenge your scorn of me and that I will accuse you before the Father. There is no need for me to accuse; Moses himself will accuse you, whose authority you pretend is most revered among you, and in whom you put the highest trust, treating whatever he wrote as an oracle. But as you falsely revered John, whose witness about me you do not believe, as you falsely revere the sayings of the prophets, now persecuting the one they promised; as you falsely worship God, whose deeds you do not acknowledge and whose Son you hate; so you falsely worship Moses, whose authority with you is scant on that very point on which it should have chiefly prevailed. Indeed, he wrote about me. For when your forefathers, struck down by the awesome voice of God and by death-dealing fire, prayed not to hear the voice of God again or to experience his terrible fire, God approved your request and promised Moses that he would raise up from among your brothers an extraordinary prophet, one like Moses, whose calm and gentle voice you were to hear not terrifying you with threats but inviting you to salvation. God threatened punishment for the one who does not obey the words of this prophet, saying, "But whoever does not heed his words, which he will speak in my name, I shall be the avenger." Again, "Whoever heeds a prophet who comes in his own name and speaks things that God has not commanded him, he orders him to be killed."[56] Then no one else will accuse you more before God than your darling Moses, whose writings you scorn. He promised that I would be calm and gentle and would speak all the things God wished. Such I am, and you reject me. He orders death for the one who comes in his own name and speaks from his own spirit. Out of hatred for me you embrace such a one, as better matching your debased lusts. So you are not only unyielding to me but also to Moses himself, whose promises you do not trust. For if you trusted Moses you would of course[57] believe in me also, whom he promised and whose words he ordered believed. So it is not surprising if you do not believe my words, for you openly scorn me as lowly, since you have no trust in Moses' writings, whose authority you want to seem so great among you, and of whom you think so highly.'

With words of this kind the Lord Jesus, the light and the truth, accused and revealed the false religion of the Jews, than which nothing can be more opposed to gospel godliness, so that it would be quite clear to all that those who were not moved by the number and greatness of the testimonies about him, or lured by his good deeds and kind words, or frightened by threats, or called forth to faith by desire for eternal life, or made repentant of their unbelief by fear of hell perished by their own fault. And if our Lord Jesus had said this to Samaritans or gentiles, especially if miracles added persuasion to his words, those people would have been turned to repentance. But the citizens of Jerusalem, scribes, Pharisees, and priests, made no reply to these things, which could not be refuted. They continued nonetheless in their murderous thoughts and schemed death for the one who offered them the benefit of eternal life.

Chapter 6

So for the time being Jesus yielded to their madness and withdrew from them,[1] swollen as they were with pride from their belief in a false religion and their ignorant knowledge of the law.[2] He returned to simpler people, going to Galilee again, not back to Cana[3] this time but to the territory on the other side of the lake that is called Tiberian because Tiberius Caesar had founded a town named Tiberias on the shore there.[4] A great crowd of people followed him there: some drawn by a desire for miracles because they had seen him take away people's diseases with his strange power; some, who were incurably ill, to be healed by him; some thirsting for his teaching.[5] When he saw that all these assorted people were so enthusiastic that they were following him far into the wilderness without thinking about what they would eat, he prepared his disciples for a miracle, because he wanted what he was going to do to be well understood and fixed in their minds, for they were still untrained. He slipped away with the disciples up a hill. In so doing he showed that though one who professes to be a shepherd of the people often involves himself for their benefit in the lowest matters, he must still sometimes raise his mind to higher things, whenever his heart is to be called forth by sacred study or prayer to contemplation of the divine. The crowd stayed on lower ground; only the disciples accompanied Jesus, because bishops ought to be free from base cares about temporal matters, and must look down as if from a height at things that amaze ignorant folk.[6] So, somewhat removed from the crowd, Jesus sat down on the hillside with his disciples where he could have the crowd in view. For bishops ought not withdraw from Christ, though the people stay fixed at lower levels. And bishops must sit on the hill, that is, find repose in heavenly studies; in the lower matters that they deal with out of love as circumstances require, they must walk rather than sit.[7] But our heart should not be so delighted in contemplation of the sublime that we forget to care for the multitude. For the purpose of the bishops' retreat is that they may return to the care of their people more eager and better equipped. And it is not fitting for the vicars of Christ to retreat for drinking-parties, sexual indulgence, gambling, hunting, or similar pleasures, but for this reason, that a heart worn out from dulling occupations may be restored in quiet for the gospel task by purer prayers, unceasing supplications, sacred studies, holy conversations.

Now while this was going on in Galilee, it was nearly the feast of the Passover, a high holy day for the Jews. If Jesus had wanted to win himself a reputation for devoutness, it was better for him to be at Jerusalem. But he wanted to show by a kind of symbol of coming things that because of the unbelief of the citizens of Jerusalem, rebels against God, their house would be deserted, and that when the gospel religion was made known, all their unspiritual worship would cease, and at last the true Passover would be celebrated wherever worldly affections were abandoned and the heart passed over[8] to love of the divine.[9] So he preferred to be in Galilee in the wilderness rather than in Jerusalem at the temple.

So when Jesus opened his eyes and saw that the crowd was unusually large, he readied the hearts of his disciples for sure faith in a miracle.[10] He wanted them to realize and take note that food was in short supply and that the crowd stretching out before their eyes was immense, and that there were only a very few loaves that they themselves could offer to Jesus with their own hands and distribute to the people, and, finally, that there were many full baskets which they would collect from the remains of the meal. He wanted to ensure that there would be nothing they did not understand or take note of, or not remember later. For he knew that the hearts of his followers were still untrained and forgetful. So he said to Philip, testing his heart, and gradually shaping it to faith in the coming miracle, 'Where shall we buy bread, so that there will be something for this huge crowd to eat?' Our Lord Jesus did not ask this because he did not know how much bread or other food there was, but partly, as was just said, to alert the apostles to reflect on the miracle, and partly so that everyone might learn how unconcerned about provisions were the disciples who followed Jesus, and how satisfied with cheap and ordinary food.[11] But Philip was not yet expecting a miracle, though he had seen Jesus turn water into wine at the wedding feast, and when he calculated how little money they had and how large the crowd was, he replied, 'Lord, why do you ask about buying bread? Even if we were to buy two hundred denarii worth, it would hardly be enough, I don't mean enough to fill them, hungry as they are from not eating for a long time now, but so each one could have just a taste and escape the worst of hunger.'

When Philip said this, Simon Peter's brother Andrew, a somewhat wiser man, had already roused his heart to hope for a miracle, but not yet with complete trust. He had seen the water turned to wine, and did not entirely doubt that bread could also increase, but he supposed it would be only proportionately, a smaller quantity coming from some few loaves and a larger quantity from more loaves. Yet Jesus needed no raw materials for making bread, since he creates what he wants and when he wants, even from nothing.[12] So Andrew said, 'There is a boy here who has five barley loaves and two fish, but what is so little for so large a crowd, and one already very hungry?' When Jesus saw that the apostles were quite aware of the lack of food and had taken note of the size of the crowd, wanting to rouse their hearts to look for a miracle, he told them to have the people sit down in the grass (for there was plenty of grass there). Now the disciples did not say, 'Why do they need to sit down, since there is nothing to set before them? What we have would be hardly enough for ourselves.' Instead, obeying Jesus' instructions without question, they arranged the people in groups and had them sit down as if for a banquet. Indeed, the people's trust too was simple and straightforward: they did what the apostles told them even though they saw no meal prepared.[13] And those who sat down were about five thousand.

So Jesus took the five barley loaves and after he had given thanks to the Father in his usual way, he broke them[14] and gave them to his disciples to hand out to the people.[15] By having the disciples serve the food he was already shaping and moulding them to be pastors, and, as stewards of the gospel message, to feed the hearts of Christ's flock with spiritual food. For that is the bread which comes down from heaven and gives eternal life to those who feed on it hungrily.[16] Bishops hand out and distribute this bread to the people, but the bishops have it from nowhere else than Christ's hands and only after they have given thanks to the heavenly Father, to whom everything received for the welfare of mankind is properly attributed, and to him as the source our Lord Jesus always ascribed all the wonders he did on earth. And in so doing the Lord reminds us that if we have any outstanding ability, we are not to claim the credit for ourselves but to pass on all the glory to God, from whom comes everything that truly deserves praise.[17] What he had done with the five loaves he now did also with the two fish, dividing them among the disciples, and as he gave each disciple a share, by his will the fish increased to what he knew was enough to satisfy everyone, enough even for a great surplus,[18] so that their faith in the miracle would be more sure.

Then when the crowd was filled with food, Jesus took steps to ensure confidence in what had happened with another proof as well, so that no one would claim that it was trickery or make-believe.[19] He said to his disciples, 'Gather up the remains of the meal so nothing is wasted.' It turned out that after everyone had had his fill enough remained to fill twelve baskets.[20] Jesus in his kindness had increased the meagre provision of five loaves and two fish to this great quantity, and in so doing he taught us that generosity to the poor should not be skimped;[21] on the contrary, he who has undertaken the task of feeding the Lord's flock must provide bountifully from the rich store of divine Scripture whatever is necessary to teach, advise, console, and hearten those who are in need of such nourishment.

Now those who had eaten their fill knew that five loaves, barley loaves at that, and two fish had been found, and they saw how many basketfuls were left over. So they began to sound the praises of Jesus, saying 'This is truly the long-expected prophet[22] who was to come into the world.' It is typical of the common people that they are more aware of benefits to belly than to brain.[23] They had seen greater miracles, but they had never rendered him such splendid praise; it was full stomachs that wrung out this language. And now, inexperienced and foolish as they still were, looking for a messiah to claim an earthly kingdom for them, they schemed together to snatch up Jesus and make him their king, promising themselves goods in abundance, plenty of grain, wealth, freedom, and the other comforts of this world if they were lucky enough to have such a king. But Jesus was aiming for quite a different kingdom, and had come to teach us to despise wealth, pleasure, and earthly glory; so, well aware of what they were plotting, he went back up on the hill that he had left to feed them. He slipped away secretly by himself, so that they did not realize he had gone. When they invited him to be king he stole quietly away; when they forced him to the cross he went forward to meet them, setting a clear model before those who would be his vicars. No one who loves power and glory in the eyes of men can be an honest steward of the gospel message; pastors must not only not strive for these things but must even shun them when they are spontaneously offered.[24] For the kingdom of heaven has nothing in common with the kingdom of earth, no more than light has with darkness.

The disciples waited a long time on the hillside for the Lord. But evening was coming on and they did not want nightfall to overtake them in the wilderness, so they went down to the lake, to cross over to the town of Capernaum, where Jesus made his home.[25] They hoped that he would meet them in another vessel during the crossing, or that they would find him in town. It was already dark when they were ready to sail; yet though his followers had waited for him long and eagerly, Jesus had not come to them. He knew quite well how the disciples ached with longing for him, but he wanted to fire their longing[26] more by staying away, and also to teach us how great our danger is, what darkness and storms of this world threaten us when we are separated from Jesus.[27] And now the material for a greater miracle was being prepared. The lake was large enough for them to call it a sea;[28] night made it more threatening, and far from that being the only danger, strong opposing winds were making it very rough. Nonetheless, out of longing for their master, the disciples dared to launch their boat.

When they had rowed out some three or four miles and were far from shore and almost on the point of despair, suddenly our Lord Jesus was with them. They saw him through the darkness, coming on foot over the waves of the lake as if he were treading on solid ground; so he declared himself Lord not only of the earth but of all the elements. Indeed, even in the darkness the gospel love has eyes, and where Jesus is there is no night; no storm is deadly where he who makes all things calm is near at hand.[29] But though the Lord was now close to the ship the disciples were terrified. Because they could not see clearly through the darkness they suspected that he was one of the many nocturnal spectres that are believed to haunt those who sail at night.[30] But Jesus wanted to take away all their fear by the familiar sound of his voice, so he said to them, 'It is I; don't be afraid,' indicating that those who have Jesus with them need fear no earthly storm, no matter how fierce. And indeed he is present to the end of time to all his followers who depend on him in simple and steadfast faith. But the disciples, recovering their courage at the sound of their teacher's voice, wanted to get him into the ship; they were still a little frightened for him, weak and wavering as their faith was. But so that our Lord Jesus could show them that the whole episode was taking place by divine power and that the storm had not stopped by accident,[31] the ship, which a moment before had been far from any shore, suddenly was at the port they had been bound for. These proofs fixed the miracle firmly in the minds of the disciples, whose belief had to be shaped and strengthened by every means available.

This wonder was not entirely concealed even from the crowd. They had waited on the far side of the lake when they saw that there was no boat there except the one in which the apostles had crossed, and when they saw the apostles casting off, they had been sure that Jesus had not embarked with them and that the disciples were leaving without him. The next day they wondered where he had gotten to, because even that morning he did not appear anywhere, though the people he had fed the day before looked for him long and eagerly. So concluding that he would not be away for very long from his disciples, who had already gone on ahead, they decided to cross too, in hopes that they could find him on the opposite side. There were already some ships there, not from Capernaum but from Tiberias, a coastal town not far from the place where they had been fed to the full on five barley loaves and thus sated had thanked God[32] for sending such a prophet to his people. Since these ships were available to take them across and Jesus, though much looked for, was nowhere to be found, they embarked and went over to Capernaum to look for him there, because he had a home in the town and they knew that the apostles had gone there. When they found Jesus in that very place and saw that he had crossed the lake though there was no ship in which he could have done so, wondering how he had come over, they asked him, 'Teacher, when did you get here?' wanting to calculate from the time how he had crossed. For they suspected that some miracle had taken place here too, just as the day before he had fed a huge crowd.[33] But yesterday's enthusiasm to make him king whether he wanted to be or not had by now cooled off.[34]

Not wanting to seem to be making a show of his power, Jesus did not reply, so they would learn of the miracle more convincingly from the disciples and from the evidence they discovered themselves. But he sharply rebuked[35] the temper of the crowd, not only fickle, but stupid, and not at all worthy of the gospel teaching. He reproved them because even though they had seen greater miracles that proved his divine power, they were more moved by being fed at one meal than by desire for eternal salvation; because they valued the body's food too highly, by which[36] support is provided repeatedly and only for a little while to a thing that will soon die, and were not hungering much more for the food without which the soul perishes forever; and also because they had such a foolish conception of him that they thought he was performing miracles just to be rewarded by a rabble with an earthly kingdom. Yet in fact he had provided proof of his divine power with several carefully chosen miracles only in order to win through the evidence of the body's senses credence for his teaching, which promised things the senses could not perceive, and in this way to bring the weak and untrained step by step to higher things. Just so a good teacher would wish his student, if it were possible, to grasp the whole of the subject-matter at once; but as it is he shapes and moulds the unschooled mind in basic steps until he has brought it along to a complete knowledge of the subject and there is no longer need for beginners' lessons. And though the teacher undertakes the task of elementary instruction with some distaste, he chokes it back in the hope of progress, making every effort to waste as little time as possible on that dull stuff.[37]

Now Jesus wanted to declare his divinity here too, in knowing what they were thinking, so when he saw the crowd streaming towards him again, eager for more miracles that would fill their bellies rather than train their minds, he used the opportunity of the food once offered to them to teach them what food they should seek most of all. He spoke to this effect:

'What I have to say is most certainly true. You call me Teacher, not because you are eager for my teaching, which is entirely spiritual, but because you chase after trivial human pleasures, which are worth more to you than things that are far more important. Now you are avidly seeking me out, but not on account of the miracles that were supposed to call you to higher matters; yesterday's feast excites you more than wonder at divine power, and you think it a great thing if someone supplies you with food for your bodies at no charge. It is no great thing to feed these bodies, bound in any case to die; but food will never fail those who hunger for the gospel teaching. So turn your every effort to getting the food that once eaten is not destroyed in digestion,[38] and does not, like ordinary bread, prolong the body's life for a short time only to have hunger soon return; instead it remains in the person, quickening the soul with spiritual nourishment and giving it eternal life. The Son of man will give you this most excellent bread if he sees you striving and hungering for it. In fact God has wished to bestow eternal salvation on the human race, and has appointed the Son of man for this very purpose, giving him the authority and winning your respect for him by miracles, so that he can bestow spiritual food on all those hungry for eternal life. For he did not come into the world to gain temporal glory for himself or to enrich others with benefactions of this kind; rather, his business is to lift people out of their base cares to care for the divine.'

The ignorant crowd did not understand this, and, entirely bent on their belly's business, were not even paying attention.[39] They answered, 'You advise us to work for a sort of food that will stay in us and give us eternal life; what shall we do, then, to perform things worthy of God and to earn this eternal life, since you say you came into the world for our sake?' Jesus was not at all offended at the foolishness of this answer, and proceeded to draw them gradually toward a fuller understanding. 'You are asking, he said, 'what things you can do to oblige God, who is spirit and who delights in things of the spirit; it is not sacrificing victims, or observing the Sabbath, or ritual bathing, or dietary restrictions, or wearing special clothing, or the other things that make up outward ceremonial.[40] What God requires you to do is to believe in his Son, whom he sent and through whom he speaks to you, lest it appear that he is bestowing eternal life on clearly ungrateful, or rather unworthy, people.' At this the crowd, which credited itself with an exceptional degree of devoutness because of its strict observance of the law of Moses, made a reply that was not just foolish but displeasing and even sinful: 'If you lay claim,' they said, 'to a special authority above and beyond that of our forefathers which we have followed till now, show us an example and proof of this God-given authority, so we can see it and believe in your actions, not your words. It is not fair to expect us to believe in your mere assertion of authority without some sign. We would not have rashly believed in our forefathers if they had not created confidence in their divine authority by means of a sign from heaven. When Moses[41] led our people, our forefathers ate manna in the wilderness. This was really the bread of God, and heavenly bread that did not spoil, as it is written in the Psalms: he gave them bread of heaven to eat. So the people, deeply moved by such a miraculous sign, obeyed Moses. If you can do something like that, or even better, we will believe in you too.'

Foolish, displeasing, and sinful as it was, the people's reply still did not weary Jesus' gentle patience in drawing them[42] towards the knowledge of spiritual truths. First they demanded a sign, as if they had seen no earlier miracle; and they did not accept just any miracle, but as if dictating to him they instructed him about what kind of a sign they wanted. Further, of all the signs that are recorded as being given to the ancient Hebrews, they chose the very one that has to do with feeding, so worried were they about their bellies.[43] Jesus overlooked the people's ignorance and led them slowly to an awareness of spiritual matters in this way: 'If Moses,' he said, 'carries great weight with you because he gave you manna from heaven, and you regard that food as heavenly because it came from heaven, you owe your thanks to God, who was the source of the manna and to whom is owed the glory of every miracle. Moses could not have done this by himself; he was no more than the servant of God.[44] And that bread was not truly heavenly bread, though the Psalmist called it bread of heaven. It did not come from heaven; it rained down[45] from out of the air, and only had the appearance of the truly heavenly bread.[46] In the same way we speak of birds, which live in the skies, as being of heaven.[47] But just as God through his earthly servant Moses gave bread for the body to an unspiritual people, so now my Father through his heavenly Son bestows on you, his spiritual people, the bread that truly comes from heaven. It not only satisfies your bodies for a time; it gives to those who eat it immortality of soul. Moses' bread was physical bread, and it supplied life to your physical selves only for a time, and it did this lesser service only to a single people. But the bread I am talking about is not physical, and it does not rain down from the air, but comes from God himself;[48] and it is so effective that it gives life not to the body but to the soul, and not to one people but to the whole world. But if authority is what moves you, instead of Moses, in whom you take such pride, you have God as the author of this gift. Instead of the servant of God, you have the Son of God. If you consider the gift, there is as much difference between Moses' gift and mine as between body and soul or as between this brief mortal life and life everlasting in heaven.'

Even in spite of hearing this the Jews were not roused to love of divine things; still dreaming about the belly's business they said, 'Lord, give us this bread always.' They loved satiety better than salvation, and they looked for a sater rather than a saviour.[49] So in order to shake the dream of physical food from them, Jesus explained more openly that he was not talking about bread that is chewed with the teeth, passes through the throat into the stomach, and soothes the body's hunger for a time; he meant heavenly bread, which is the divine word.[50] He said, 'I am that bread, the bestower of eternal life. Whoever hungers for this and comes to me, and lets it pass by faith into the bowels of his soul will not hunger again when nagging emptiness after satiety returns; but it will remain in him who has eaten it even to eternal life. And my words[51] contain the source of spiritual water, which is drunk by the soul, not the body, through faith. And so whoever believes in me not only will not hunger but will not even thirst for evermore. This bread is eaten not with an open mouth but with a believing soul. I have told you this so that you understand that your destruction will be your own fault if you persist in your unbelief. The Father denies this bread to no one, and has offered it to you first of all, but anxiousness for mortal bread touches you more. You have seen me performing greater things than if I had fed you on manna, and I am promising still more blessed things, and yet you do not believe. But the Father did not send this bread into the world in vain, even if you disdain it because of your unbelief. There will be no shortage of those to whom the bread will bring eternal life, even if the entire Jewish nation rejects the Son – a nation on this account sinful even towards God, because they scorn the Son whom he sent for the salvation of the whole world. For my Father is not only the God of the Jews, but of all peoples.[52] I have nothing of myself; but whatever he has given me, of whatever people it is, it will come to me by faith,[53] even if it is foreign to the law of Moses. I will not cast out anyone who comes to me; and I wish that everyone would come. For with all his might the Father wants all humankind to be saved by faith. I came down from heaven for this, not to do what I want myself, as if in disagreement with the Father, but to do what the Father who sent me wants; my will cannot differ from his, since it is the same will.

'And the will of the Father who sent me is this, that nothing of anything he has given me by faith should be lost, if I save it; and that the world not snatch away for death what the Father has given for life. But even if by the law of human nature the body dies, still the better part of a person, the living soul, survives; and so that the whole person may live again through me, the Father also wants me to restore the dead body to life on the last day. For the will of the Father who sent me is this, to bestow eternal life through the Son on all, and not through the law of Moses but through faith in the gospel. The Father does nothing except through the Son. So anyone who does not acknowledge the Son does not acknowledge the Father; and anyone who is against the Son is also against the Father. The Father is invisible,[54] but seen in the Son. So the Son will not allow anyone to die who sees the Son and acknowledges him and believes in his words; but even if he is dead in the body, in accordance with the Father's will the Son will revive him on the last day, so that whole in both soul and body he may live with the Son in whom he has believed. The Father gave to the Son the power to restore life even to the dead.'

When Jesus said this, the people, who had been putting up with his talk thus far out of hope of food, now saw that their hope of physical feeding had been taken away, so they turned abusive.[55] The man whom they wanted to make king when their bellies were full they now scorned as contemptible and accused as presumptuous. They did not yet in fact do so openly, but muttered among themselves, especially about the remark that they ought to have chiefly embraced: 'I am the living bread[56] that came down from heaven.' For they were eager for bread for the body, and they thought themselves mocked by this remark, though something far more important was being offered than they had expected. The weakness of the human body got in their way, because they only saw with physical eyes, while from the things done and said, they could have perceived divine power, if only they had had the eyes of faith.[57] They said, 'Isn't this the son of Joseph the carpenter,[58] and don't we know his father and mother by sight, poor and humble people? Really, since he was born here among us on earth not so long ago, a man from men like ourselves, why does he brazenly say that he came down from heaven? Or what other father is he telling us about?'

While they whispered such things to each other, Jesus made plain that the thoughts of humankind are not concealed from him,[59] and clarified as well as confirmed his earlier words. He said, 'There is no reason for you to mutter about what I have said to you. My words do not stay fast in your hearts because your unbelief prevents it. Seeing, you do not see, and hearing, you do not hear,[60] and though present, you are absent. Whoever comes to me will gain eternal life, but the coming to me is by faith. Faith does not happen by chance but by the inspiration of the Father.[61] As through the Son the Father draws human minds to himself, so by the secret inspirations of faith he draws them to the Son, so that the coming to each is through the other. He does not grant so great a gift except to willing and eager people. And whoever has deserved to be drawn by the Father because of his ready will and devout zeal will achieve eternal life through me. For as I said, I will recall even the dead to life when the last day comes, on which the happiness of the devout and the destruction of the wicked shall be perfected. Whoever believes in me receives a great thing, but he owes even this to the Father, without whom no one can believe. Yet those who do not believe are not cleared of the charge on the ground that they were not drawn to belief. For the Father wants without reservation to draw everyone to him. Anyone who is not drawn is himself at fault, because he withdraws from the one who wants to draw him near. Human matters are learned with human zeal; this heavenly philosophy is not grasped unless the secret inspiration of the Father makes the human heart ready to be taught.

'This is in fact what the prophets foretold would one day happen: "And they all will be taught by God."[62] But the lusts of this world make many unable to learn, because while they sink into these earthly matters they do not allow their heart to rise to heavenly things. The gift is God's but the effort is yours. In vain does anyone hear my words with his physical ears, unless he first hears the secret voice of the Father within, the voice that breathes on his mind the imperceptible grace of faith. Then the Father in this way draws[63] all those who show themselves fit for this inspiration; and whoever has been drawn at last comes to me.

'For God is spirit,[64] and is not heard or seen except in spiritual ways. To have seen and heard him thus is salvation. Many will see and hear the Son to their own hurt. And yet you boast that God was seen and heard by Moses and the prophets. No mortal has seen or heard God as he really is;[65] this has been granted to the Son alone, who alone has come from God, with whom he was forever before he came into this world. So shake off the base cares of this physical life from your souls and strive to achieve eternal life by your eagerness for spiritual goods. Forget the bread that fills your bodies; seek the heavenly bread that bestows eternal life. It is received by faith[66] and faith must be obtained from God the Father. Be very sure of this: whoever has trust in me already has eternal life, since he has the source of immortality. I am the bread that gives life, not temporary life for the body but eternal life for the soul. Though you have me before you, you still want manna, as if it were something wonderful. But manna, which your forefathers ate in the desert for some days, though it came down from heaven, as you think, gave them nothing more than wheat or barley bread gives. It dispelled the body's hunger for a little while, though the hunger would soon return and demand food again, but it did not give them immortality. For your forefathers, however happy they were as often as they ate that manna, are dead. My bread has truly come down from heaven, and it has from God the heavenly power to cause anyone who eats it to live entirely and forever and never to be in bondage to death. So it is not necessary to demand manna from heaven when you have the truly heavenly bread present and ready for you, the bread that bestows eternal life if only you are willing to take it by faith. For I myself am the bread that bestows immortal life, I who am the only one to have come down from heaven, though you, hindered by the weakness of this body, think that I am nothing else than the son of Joseph and Mary. For I am the word[67] of God the Father, and whoever believes in me will have immortal life. If anyone lets this heavenly bread pass into the bowels of his soul he will be quickened and will grow strong into eternal life. But if you, being unspiritual, do not yet understand spiritual matters, I will say something simpler[68] and related to the flesh. This flesh that you see is also living bread, which I shall pay and hand over to death to ransom the life of the whole world. Believe, take, and live.'[69]

With these words[70] our Lord Jesus revealed to them in riddling statements the mystery of his divinity, through which he has always existed with God his Father; and the mystery of his death, by which he would free the world from the tyranny of death; and finally the mystery of his mystical body, for unless a person is grafted and fixed in his body as a slip is fixed in the vine,[71] he will not have life in himself. And Jesus knew quite well that the Jews were not yet at that time capable of understanding these words, but he also knew that once these seeds of the mysteries were planted in the hearts of good people, they would some day sprout and bear plentiful fruit.

So because these seemed to them silly things to say and they did not dare to address the Lord, a difference of opinion arose among them, various ones interpreting what was said in various ways. For just as Nicodemus did not grasp Jesus' remarks about heavenly rebirth, and the Samaritan woman did not understand Jesus' puzzling remark about water bubbling up to eternal life,[72] so the still more foolish people argued how it could happen that a human being could give his flesh to be eaten by others so as to be sufficient for everyone for eternal life. He had invited everyone to eat heavenly bread, and then he said that the bread was his flesh. They said, 'How are we going to eat the flesh of a living person?'

Again well aware what they were arguing about, Jesus did not yet show in what manner flesh could be eaten in place of bread, but he now confirmed that what they thought silly and impossible is necessary.[73] He said, 'Be sure that unless you consume my whole self, that is, unless you eat the flesh of the Son of man as bread and drink his blood as wine, you will not have life in you. On the contrary, whoever eats my flesh and drinks my blood has eternal life from that eating and drinking. Not only will his soul live in bliss on this food and drink, but his body will also be revived and the whole person will enjoy eternal life with me. For as human food that has passed into the stomach and been distributed throughout the members becomes the substance of the body, so that the food is now identical with the person who eats it, likewise conversely whoever eats me is spiritually changed into me.[74] Then since I am the author and pioneer of the resurrection,[75] I will not allow my members to be torn from me. On the last day I shall raise from the dead anyone who has been grafted[76] into me by this food and drink, so that because he wholly believed in me, he shall wholly live with me forever. Food for the body does not provide this, nor the manna of which you boast; it is provided by eating my body and drinking my blood. So my flesh is truly the bread which provides immortality and my blood is truly the drink that bestows eternal life, not on the body alone but on the whole person.

'The life of the body, which is nourished by food every day lest it die before its time, is shared by all the members of the body, because of the undivided participation of all the parts together, for though the members of the body are different, there is still only one body, because the members are quickened by one soul.[77] Likewise, whoever eats my flesh and drinks my blood is so joined and united to me that I cannot be torn from him nor he from me. For I am in him through my Spirit, through which I impart life to him, and he is in me, like a member of a body or a slip in a vine, in an indissoluble partnership. The Father who sent me is the first source of all life. Whoever is joined to him becomes a sharer in life. Therefore as the Father is in me and imparts to me life and the power of giving life to others, likewise to anyone who eats me, and by the mystical eating and drinking is so joined to me that he becomes one body with me, I myself shall impart life,[78] not life that will last for a little while but eternal life.

'Whatever is earthly is also short-lived and able to do little. The manna that poured down on you out of the sky when Moses was your leader was not able to provide your ancestors with eternal life because it was food for the body. For though they all ate it, they died, and not one out of so many survives; many are even dead in spirit since in many ways they provoked God to anger. But this bread, which has truly come down[79] from heaven, has heavenly power and gives eternal life to the one who eats it.'

With such words our Lord Jesus instructed the unschooled and foolish crowd, wanting to draw them from the love of visible and physical things to the desire for things heavenly and eternal. Moreover, he said this in the synagogue, at a well-attended gathering of people,[80] playing the part of a teacher. And yet so far were the foolish people from being capable of understanding these heavenly mysteries that even some of the disciples, taking offence, prepared to desert their master, muttering to each other, 'This is a hard saying about eating the flesh and drinking the blood of a living person. Who could stand to listen to such teaching?'

Understanding what they were muttering to each other, Jesus tried to soothe their sense of outrage. He said that they would see with their own eyes greater things than they now heard him saying about himself, and that what he had said about eating his flesh and drinking his blood was not at all silly or repugnant, but gentle and salutary, if it was understood in a spiritual sense and not according to their dull perception.[81] So turning to his disciples, who were supposed to be wise beyond the common run of mankind because of their daily familiarity with Jesus and the miracles they had seen, he scolded their slowness in this fashion: 'Does this talk offend your ears, that I said that I am the bread that has come from heaven to give life to the world? Is it harder, in the dull understanding of human thought, to have come down from heaven or to ascend into heaven? Then what if some day you see this Son of man, whom you now see clothed in a human body, ascend into heaven where he was before he came down, before he had this mortal body? This much is conceded to your senses, not so that you may always know the flesh but so that you may proceed from flesh to spirit. Spirit came down from heaven and took a human body; the flesh having now become spiritual will be taken up into heaven, not so that you may always love the flesh but so that instructed through the flesh you may proceed to heavenly things.[82] For flesh by itself is helpless; it is spirit that gives life. What is the bulk of a human body if spirit is not there? So my words,[83] understood according to the flesh, will not bestow life unless you understand them spiritually as coming from heaven. By my flesh and blood I mean my teaching;[84] if you take it eagerly through belief and pass it into the bowels of your mind, it will quicken your souls and will make you one body with me so that by my spirit you live forever, just as the members of a single body live by their shared breath as long as they are joined together. And I shall leave my flesh and my blood as a mystical symbol of this union, though it will do no good to have received that unless you receive it in spirit. So do not refuse my words[85] if, still being unspiritual, you do not yet understand them as you should; instead, make the effort to understand them. For the words which I have spoken to you are not unspiritual, as you are interpreting them, but are spirit and life. If spiritually understood they bestow life on the soul. Whoever takes them rightly eats my flesh and drinks my blood and, joined to me, gains eternal life. But whoever spurns them persists in death because of the wrongdoings of his former life, and because of his unbelief doubles the sentence of death on himself. And whoever does not believe my words spurns the bread that is offered. I know that to some these things are said in vain, for I am well aware that there are some among you who do not have faith in what I say, and, rejecting the life that is offered, choose destruction for themselves.'

It did not escape our Lord Jesus, even before he said this, which of his disciples were going to believe. Indeed, he even knew that among the twelve disciples whom he had honoured with the name apostles, and whom he had particularly chosen as his most trustworthy friends, there would be one who would betray him to the Jews to be killed. So Jesus took note of these, because though they heard the same words as the others, and though one of the twelve would eat from the same loaf as the others and drink from the same cup, still they would not attain life, because they ate the heavenly bread not spiritually but unspiritually. He added, 'That is why I said to you a little while ago that no one can come to me unless it has been granted to him from heaven by my Father. It is useless to have heard this voice, to have seen and touched this body, unless the heavenly Father grants the eyes of faith by which I am profitably seen; unless he grants heavenly ears for the mind, by which I am fruitfully heard.'

These words of Jesus, full of salutary teaching, did not go into the hearts of those whose mind was occupied with earthly lusts and who grasped nothing heavenly outside the dulling religion of the law of Moses. And so after these words, many, both from the people and also from Jesus' disciples, who had followed him till now, deserted the master, and where they ought to have become better, if they had understood rightly, they became so much worse that they even removed themselves from association and companionship with Jesus, by the very act as it were condemning his teaching.

But Jesus, already displaying the model for teachers of the gospel, did not demean himself by struggling to make them stay, because he did not want to do what others generally do, that is, appear to be in need of their company; and he did not abuse them as they left, because he did not want to appear to have sought his own glory more than their salvation.[86] And yet he did not cast them off from himself, for they might think better of it later. But as they went away, he wanted to make it clear that they were at fault in taking offence and leaving, and that his words would not be without fruit, even if some made themselves unworthy of the heavenly gift through their unbelief. So, turning to the twelve whom he had chosen as particular witnesses and heralds of everything he did, he drew forth their declaration without holding them by blandishments, as if he were doing his own business rather than theirs; and without frightening them by threats or abuse, lest they seem to be following Jesus by compulsion more than by persuasion. For no one should be forced to the gospel faith, and Jesus prefers an open defector to a contrived and counterfeit companion. So as the others left, Jesus said to the twelve, 'Don't you want to go as well? You are free to, unless you think that it is to your interest to stay. Indeed, I want this heavenly gift to come to everyone through me, but it is not to be given to those who reject it, since they do not deserve it, and no one can receive it unless he has desired it. But that someone desire it is also the gift of the Father.'

At this Simon Peter, always a man of simple and fervent faith in Jesus, taking the part of the whole church,[87] replied for himself and the others with great eagerness, 'Far be it from us, Lord, to leave you; besides, we are eager for eternal life, and we know very well how frigid are the teachings of the Pharisees, and we have heard John witnessing about you. Then to whom else shall we go? For you are the only one who says the things that bring eternal life. You will not drive us away now that we are admitted, for you welcome everyone; and we do not want to change our lord, since whomever we choose, we are bound to make a change for the worse. For not only relying on your words do we believe, but from your very deeds we have learned and are assured that you are the Christ, the Son of God, from whom all people must hope for eternal salvation.'

Jesus showed no amazement at Peter's fine affirmation about himself[88] because he did not want to seem caught up by human praises, nor did he reject it, lest he deny what was true. But while urging everyone to continue steadfast in the affirmation that Simon had made in the name of all of them, he hinted that there would be one of those few who not only would leave him as the other disciples had done, but would strike a bargain with his enemies and betray his master to be killed. But he preferred to indicate it covertly, not wanting to betray Judas, in case someone should think Judas was stirred up by this insult and was taking justified revenge on the Lord, and also wanting by his remarks to make them all anxious not to slip into such wickedness by their own doing.[89] He said, 'Why are you surprised that some of my disciples have left me? Didn't I choose you out of all of them as being superior? But among so few and so particularly chosen there is one devil, who will betray him whose body he will have eaten and whose blood he will have drunk in the flesh, not in the spirit, whose words he will have heard and whose miracles he will have seen. So do not abandon what you have begun, as they did whom you saw leave, but always advancing to better things continue steadfast until you are made worthy to eat in spirit the food of my heavenly teaching, and, thus changed into me, to achieve eternal life.'

Chapter 7

Now in conversations of this kind, echoing with heavenly matters too great for a mere mortal, and in the miracles he had done, our Lord Jesus had fanned a great jealousy of himself among his own people, who were more scornful of him because they knew him on everyday terms, and furthermore, the humble circumstances of his home and his parents aggravated their jealousy.[1] At the time he was staying in Galilee.[2] For it was not then safe for him to live in Judea,[3] because the people of that district had been laying plots against his life for some time – not that Jesus feared death or that he did not have the means at hand to slip out of the midst of their plots whenever it seemed best to do so. But as long as he played the part of a mortal, he presented his disciples with a kind of image of future events, since they were going to be compelled to find a new home with the gentiles because of the spiteful unbelief of the Jewish nation.[4]

A day was coming that was especially festive and holy for the Jews, a feast which the Greeks call Scenopegia [Tabernacles], in memory of the early patriarchs, who lived in tents, often moving their encampment; even then in a sort of image they showed what kind of life should be led by those who proclaim the gospel teaching.[5] A great flood of people from all of Syria,[6] and even from neighbouring regions, generally went to Jerusalem for the festival, because of the fame of the temple, which at that time was reverently regarded even among the gentiles. Jesus' relatives,[7] still ignorant and in bondage to human emotions, relying on the privileges of kinship, urged him more boldly than was right, as if he were eager for glory but a little fearful and less resolute in spirit than he ought to be.[8] They said that if he was confident of his own resources he should not hide among the Galilean foreigners but should make good on the things he had said so grandly about himself, in Jerusalem, in full view of the throngs of people. 'The feast day is coming,' they said; 'leave Galilee, where you have been hiding too long, and go to Judea, the most flourishing part of the kingdom, and to Jerusalem, the capital of the whole Jewish nation.[9] If everyone sees what you do there you will be able to gather more disciples. For if anyone wants to be considered great he does not do in secret the things that can earn him a reputation with people. If you came down from heaven and have such great powers as you say, see to it that you let the world know.'

No one should be surprised at this speech of our Lord Jesus' relatives, unspiritual, arrogant, and even sinful as it is. In fact at that time not even those who were his brothers and joined to him by close family ties believed in him; yet later some of them were among the apostles and preached Christ's glory quite steadfastly.[10]

So, in accordance with his unparalleled mildness, Jesus gently corrected his relatives' impudence, indicating that in the task which he was doing on earth for the salvation of the human race, physical kinship had no privilege; but since this was entirely a heavenly task, it had to be conducted on the heavenly Father's authority; he did not fear death, which he was going to undertake willingly for the salvation of the human race, nor did he desire the glory of this world, whose hatred he aroused against himself by speaking the truth, the opposite of worldly desires. He said, 'My time has not yet come. When it urges me on, there will be no need for your advice.

How and when I am to become known to the world depends on the heavenly Father's decision, not on human purposes. I came at the Father's bidding and have my appointed time. But your time is always at hand, for led by human desires you seek the glory of this world, and you want me to glorify myself in the worldly sense. You can go where you please in safety, since the world loves you for thinking the way it does. I do not chase after glory in the world's eyes with the desire that you have, for I seek my Father's glory, and I am working for the salvation of mankind. But I am so far from grasping at glory or praise in the world that instead I stir up its hatred against me, because I take issue with its lusts and I publicly give evidence that its works are evil, though it places its pretended godliness and false happiness in them. The Jews have their festival days, which God has long detested.[11] For they sacrifice victims that are unwelcome and hateful to God because their hands are full of blood, and on these days which they want to appear pure and holy they are plotting death for the innocent. It is for me to celebrate in a spiritual way the one true festival day in which the Father takes pleasure. It has not yet come; when it does, I shall go to meet it willingly. You, who are still unspiritual and are wise in the ways of the world, go up to this festival. I will not go up to the festival with you[12] because my time is not yet fulfilled.'

With these words our Lord Jesus sent away those related to him by birth, whose influence and desires he regularly removed when the work of the gospel was to be done; since he wanted the work to be ascribed entirely to his Father's will, he did not permit it to be stained by human matters. In this way he curbed his mother's authority at the wedding, and again he did not think it fitting to be called away from the gospel message by his mother and his relatives; and when he had spent a little time in Capernaum with his kin, he left them there and went on to the task of preaching. Finally, when he was hanging on the cross, he called his mother 'woman,' as if he acknowledged no mother in that task. In fact, when he was still a boy of twelve years, he seems not to have thought it fitting to be called away from his Father's business by his relatives' authority.[13] So they, thinking that Jesus would not come to the festival out of fear of the Jews, set out alone. While they went up he stayed in Galilee, governing and managing all his actions so that sometimes he offered proofs of his human nature, lest he not be thought a real human being, and sometimes he offered evidence of his divine nature, lest he be thought to be merely mortal.[14]

But after his brothers had departed for the festival, he himself set out also, so that it would be quite clear that he had held back from the yearly gathering not so much out of fear of the Jews as to avoid the company of his relatives, because, still unspiritual as they were, he did not want them involved in the gospel task. He came to Jerusalem, not showing himself, but furtively and secretly, to arouse, of course, a greater anticipation and to come into public view in his own time with greater effect. For he knew the hearts of the Pharisees, that for a long time they had been making secret plans to seize him when the opportunity offered on a festival day.

So he was in Jerusalem but was not going out to the public gatherings as he usually did. Meanwhile the Jews were watching for him to see if he had come, and when they missed seeing him they asked each other where he was. Now the remarks being made among the people about him in his apparent absence were of various kinds, because not everyone had the same opinion of Jesus, or the same interest in him. Many of the common people who had been present when he performed miracles, who had heard his conversations and experienced his gentleness in an actual meeting with him, were saying that Jesus was a good man and not deserving of their plotting anything harsh against him. On the other hand the priests and Pharisees, who had smouldered with anger at Jesus' reputation for a long time, said that he was not a good man because he enticed the crowd to himself like a revolutionary and called them away from the respect they owed to the priests, scribes, and Pharisees.[15] All this about Jesus was spread around in secret whisperings, while no one dared to speak well of him openly, though there were quite a few who had a good opinion of him. For they feared the Jewish leaders, who they knew passionately hated Jesus because their authority seemed to be diminished by his words and deeds. Further, the fact that for a time Jesus stayed out of public view was owing to his kindness and moderation, so that he would not appear to have voluntarily provoked the jealousy of the Pharisees, who were looking for nothing but an opportunity to kill him. The fact that he came forward was a gift to those who he knew would make progress towards salvation through his teaching, since he was well aware that the Pharisees and scribes would only be made wilder by the things he was going to do or say for the salvation of the world. For the Lord, so eager for human salvation, desired that if possible his teaching would bring salvation to all; nonetheless, so much importance was not to be granted to the perversity of a few that the gospel teaching would be taken away from the simple.

So when half of the festival had gone by, Jesus openly went into the temple, and there he taught the people not the Pharisees' regulations or the ceremonies of the law that would soon end, but the gospel philosophy. But though the Jews could not fault his teaching, they were still anxious to take away the influence he had among the people. They wondered where he had gotten the things he was bringing from the store-rooms of the sacred books with great wisdom, since in their view he was uneducated and ignorant of letters, for he had never been trained in the Pharisaic teaching, in the profession of which they took an inflated pride. As if accusing him of having a demon or of having acquired his knowledge of the sacred literature by some other magical means,[16] since he had not learned it from humans, they said, 'How does this carpenter, the son of a carpenter,[17] know the sacred literature when he never studied it?'

But to give us an example of kindness and moderation, Jesus gently removed such a wicked suspicion. He showed that his teaching did not come from a human, much less from a demon, but from God, whom they also worshipped and whose glory they had to support if they wanted to be considered truly godly. But he himself claimed for himself neither the teaching at which they wondered nor the glory that they envied; it all belonged to the heavenly Father, whose work he was performing. Besides, since they laid claim to the perfect knowledge of the law handed down by God and disdained others as uneducated and ignorant, it would be only right, if they truly had knowledge of the Scriptures, that they acknowledge a teaching that came from the same source from which the law came – except that envy and hatred, desire for their own glory, love of gain, and similar base desires were blinding their mind's power of judgment. For God was not contradicting himself and now teaching through the Son something different from what he had earlier handed down through the law. So Jesus, who knows all hidden things, replied to their secret mutterings, 'My teaching, about whose source you wonder because I was not educated in the sacred literature by a man, is not mine, for I am not bringing you some new human teaching that is different from the will of God and the intent of the law handed down by God; it belongs to my Father, who sent me into the world so that the world, led astray by many human teachings and blinded by wicked desires, may know his will through me, may follow it once known, and in following it may reach eternal life. And his will is this, that you believe in the words of his Son, through whom he teaches you and speaks to you, and that in this way you attain eternal salvation.[18] The reasons why many people refuse to do it are envy, hatred, ambition, greed, and other evil desires. But if anyone repels evil and wishes in simplicity of heart to obey the will of the Father rather than his own base desires, he will easily recognize that my teaching is not a new invention of human or demon but that it has come from God, and that I do not say what I say in a human sense, but according to the intention of the Father whose delegate I am.[19]

'Mortals who desire their own glory more than God's so that they may be more highly valued in the world put their own novel teachings before the teaching of God. For they prefer to be considered the authors of human learning, of which the whole glory undiminished will revert to themselves, rather than being heralds of divine learning. And they prefer to teach the things that will win them glory and profit, rather than what will produce glory and honour for God or salvation for their neighbour. But he who does not seek his own glory but that of him by whom he was sent says everything honestly, and his teaching is not in bondage to errors or flawed by the desires of ambition, greed, envy, hatred.

'I teach nothing other than what God taught you through the law, if anyone correctly understands the intent of the law, and I do nothing other than what the law has prescribed. You who scorn me hold the authority of Moses to be sacrosanct. But did he not hand down to you the law he received from God? You lay claim for yourselves to knowledge and observance of the law; there is not one of you who truly keeps the law according to the will of God who gave the law; in fact, under cover of the law you do the things which the law chiefly punishes and detests. You charge me with blasphemy because I seek the glory of God more than human glory. You accuse me of violating the Sabbath because I saved a man's life on the Sabbath, while respect for the Sabbath does not restrain you from plotting death for an innocent man, and not only innocent but a doer of good deeds.[20] Is that glorifying Moses, whom you prefer to me? Is this respect for God the author of the law, whom you worship in pretended devotion? Does the law not curse the man who sheds innocent blood?[21] And it allows no right of killing except against evildoers, and not against those unless they are lawfully found guilty and sentenced. But I, who was sent by God and declare his will to you according to the intent of the law, I, who seek not my own glory but his, I, who do not pursue a kingdom or wealth for myself but offer free salvation to all, I, who harm no one, help everyone – why do you plot death for me against the law?'

These words of Jesus disturbed the hearts of the Pharisees[22] on two accounts: first, because they noted that though their schemes were secret they did not escape the knowledge of him who they believed could be more easily removed from their midst if what they were plotting deceived him; secondly, because in front of the people he charged those who wanted to seem most observant of the law with wickedly violating that same law. They were not in awe of God's knowledge when they were laying traps for innocent blood, but they did fear the people's knowledge. So in order to disguise their complicity in such a wicked deed by confidence before the crowd, they took refuge in open insults, which is the way of wrongdoers caught in an act which cannot be excused. They said, 'You have a demon, since you brag that God the Father is the author of your teaching. God tells the truth; at the demon's prompting you tell lies.[23] Who is scheming death for you?'

Our Lord Jesus did not reply in kind to such mad blasphemy,[24] not wanting to add fuel to their fire;[25] instead, offering us a model of mildness,[26] he gently gave an account of the action they were slandering. In fact, though they themselves were violating the law in every respect, they nonetheless accused Jesus of breaking the law because he had healed a lame man on the Sabbath. He said, 'On the day of the Sabbath I did one deed, not an evil or base deed, but one by which I gave health to an unfortunate person, a deed which even you could not have avoided approving if it had not been done on the Sabbath. It is actually those who on the Sabbath scheme to do what is a sinful deed on any day who violate the Sabbath. The sanctity of the Sabbath is not so great that it ought not yield to the matters of greater importance that are pious on any day. If Moses himself, to whom you attribute so much, has given you this example before me, if the law itself teaches that the deed can be done without violating the Sabbath, then you must either declare me innocent or else condemn Moses along with me, or rather condemn the law itself, if whatever he handed down is law.

'For Moses handed down circumcision to you, not because circumcision originated with the law, but because it was handed down by God to the patriarchs before the law. And on this account circumcision appears to be of greater importance than the Sabbath, because it preceded the law and is as it were the head of the law. But the same Moses who enjoined circumcision enjoined the Sabbath. You circumcise men on the Sabbath and do not think that you are violating the Sabbath, because of the importance of circumcision; you think it right that reverence for the Sabbath yield to it. Similarly also in the temple the Levites and priests perform the things that concern the divine service and do not think that they are violating the Sabbath, because they regard what they are doing as too holy to be neglected because of the Sabbath.[27] But if you circumcise a man on the Sabbath so that he is no different from you in foreskin, and you do not think the Sabbath is violated by this act, why do you indignantly protest[28] that the Sabbath is violated by my act, when I have cured not just one part of a man but have saved the whole man on the Sabbath? Though circumcision is prior to the law and in a way is the head of the law, it is still not forever. There were people dear to God before there was circumcision of the foreskin, and there will be a time when God will turn away from those circumcised in the flesh but uncircumcised in their minds.[29] But just as bringing healing of body and soul to one's neighbour in his wretchedness is a greater and holier deed than circumcising a man, so it is a good deed forever, before the law, under the law, and after the law,[30] because it is good in its own nature.

'Why in a like case, or rather in a more telling case as far as I am concerned, do you revere Moses and treat me as one accused of a criminal act? I am not now arguing which of us is greater than the other. Granted that you consider Moses an outstanding man, as he is; granted that I am as I seem to you, lowly and despicable; but if you are willing to look at the facts, you must condemn both of us or find us both innocent. Indeed, the law itself teaches you to look at the facts in judging cases, not at the person; and whoever favours the rich man and oppresses the poor is cursed.[31] So do not judge by the quality of the person;[32] give a just judgment according to the facts themselves, if you want to appear adherents of the law of Moses.'

Since our Lord Jesus said this and more of the same kind so gently as to soothe a heart no matter how fierce, and since it was so true that it could not be refuted by anyone no matter how shameless, the Pharisees did hold their tongues, but they still persisted in their wickedness. The thoughts that they held back in their hearts were not at all milder, because in front of the people he had dared to clear himself of the charge of violating the Sabbath by throwing back at them a much more serious charge. The pride of the Pharisees was so arrogant that they even wanted this tribute made to their authority, that an accused innocent person should abandon the rightness of his case rather than that their authority in the eyes of the people should suffer any loss, and that the glory of God should go unspoken lest anything be taken away from their own glory. This sort of person finds among the common people many who prefer to cater to his twisted ambition rather than obey the will of God.[33] For some citizens of Jerusalem were saying, 'Isn't this the man whose death the Pharisees and scribes are plotting? For we thought just now that he was hiding and not coming to the festival out of fear of them. Look, he is openly and freely speaking in the temple to their faces, and they are not answering him. What does their silence mean? Are our leaders convinced that he is the messiah, and are they admitting by their silence what they were opposing before? But no, it is not likely that our leaders think so. We certainly all know where this man came from. His parents, poor and ignorant people, are not unknown, nor is his birthplace or his brothers or the rest of his relatives. But when the messiah comes he will come in such a way that no one will know where he came from.'

Jesus [when he saw] that their blindness was so great [that] though the prophecy had said that the messiah would come from Bethlehem,[34] where Jesus had been born, and though the rest of the signs of the prophecies pointed to him, still, blinded by wickedness, they denied[35] that they recognized him just because they did recognize him, and they lyingly said that the Christ would come so that no one would know where he came from;[36] thus they would not be compelled to acknowledge him. No human secrets escape Jesus' knowledge, and he wanted to challenge the ignorance of the crowd, corrupted as it was by the desires of its leaders, an ignorance that wilfully did not know what it could have known if a wicked intention had not blocked its power of judgment.[37] Now he raised his voice so he could be heard not only by those near him but by all the people who were moving about in the temple (for that place was especially suited for preaching the glory of God), and he began to teach them openly who he was and by whom he had been sent; and that no one could not know him except someone who was wilfully ignorant or who because of his soul's wickedness did not want to admit what he knew. In this act Jesus reminded us that sometimes we must yield to human wickedness, lest further provoked it commit worse sins and call down a heavier judgment from God on itself; and likewise that after everything has been tried to correct the wicked, they must be left in their disease as hopeless; and the glory of God must not be concealed because of their stubborn sinfulness, or the salvation of our neighbour neglected.

He said, 'If it is because you know where I come from that I do not seem to you to be the messiah whom you are waiting for according to the words of the prophets, this very fact could have taught you that I am the one, since I came from and was born in the place from which the prophets said the messiah would come. You heard John's testimony about me, you see the miracles, you hear me bearing witness to the truth, desiring nothing but the glory of God and your salvation. So you cannot be ignorant of me unless you wilfully choose not to know what you do know. And how is it that you say the messiah will come in such a way that no one knows where he comes from, when the prophets mark out both his descent and his birthplace? These things, surely not unknown to you, could have helped towards an understanding of the prophecy, though it is more important to know by whom I was sent than where I was born. Not even that could escape you if you looked at me with pure and unclouded eyes. For I have not come just now from the world, as you claim so insultingly, but I have come from one who sent me into the world so that it might repent and be saved. I am sent from one who is unknown to you because he is not seen with physical eyes or heard with ears or perceived by any human sense; but I was sent by him so that through me you could come to know him too, as much as he can be known by a human being. Yet you cannot know him at all unless you seek by your devotion to earn his bestowal of the knowledge of himself on you. For those who do not obey his will do not know him. It is not enough to know God in words if you deny him in your deeds.[38] If you truly want to know the Father, you must learn from the Son. I alone truly know him because I have come from him, and I was with him before I came into the world; and I was sent into the world by him so that through me you may come to know him and be saved by your belief. For I have not come on my own account as others do, desiring their own glory instead of the glory of

God, and teaching their own lies, not God's teaching. For he who sent me is true, and since whatever I say, I say from him, my words also are true.'[39]

Angered at these words, the leaders raged in their hearts even more because he claimed so much authority for himself in front of the people and openly charged the leaders with sinful wickedness. They longed to get their hands on him. For now their anger, turned to madness, had no concern for the careful plan by which they had decided to remove him from their midst secretly. But though they had a ready will for the wicked deed, no one laid a hand on him at that time, since Christ wished it so,[40] for the time set by the Father had not yet come, when he would provide salvation for the world at the cost of his own death. As he died willingly, likewise he could only be seized willingly. He had the means at hand to restrain human hearts no matter how raging, and no human power could have prevailed against him if his boundless love for humankind had not found it best that he be crucified for the salvation of the world. So the priests, scribes, Pharisees, and leaders of the people, who especially ought to have recognized Christ because of their assertion of religion and their knowledge of the law, continued in their sinful plan because of the corrupted desires of their hearts. But some of the common people, ignorant of the law, who had as much more good will as they had less learning and authority, somehow believed in the words and miracles of our Lord Jesus. They were not yet in fact completely convinced[41] that Jesus was the messiah, but they were led by the greatness of his deeds at least to the point of seeming capable of being convinced. They said, 'If this man is not the Christ, as the Pharisees think, we still have to wonder where he gets so much power to do miracles. Indeed, if the real messiah came, would he do anything greater than what this man does?'

But after the Pharisees and elders, whose role was to draw the ignorant multitude to Christ, saw that there were many in the crowd who appeared to be rather inclined in his favour, they were led to such an extreme of madness that they decided he must die, no matter how, since it seemed that he was about to put their glory in the shade. So great a scourge is self-seeking coloured with a veil of religion and learning. Now neither respect nor reverence held them back from open wrongdoing, but the fear of risk to themselves. So they gave secret instructions to the public guards to seize him bodily in front of the people and lead him off captive like a criminal.

Since Jesus was well aware of what they were secretly plotting and since he could not be taken unless he himself wished it, he indicated to them in riddling words that he would himself willingly offer himself to the death for which he was then being sought in vain. Let them now the more eagerly make use of his presence while he was with them, for a time was coming when he would be gone and they would long in vain for the one they persecuted when he was with them, especially since they would not have the ability to follow him where he was about to go. For he was going to death, where they could not yet follow. He was returning to heaven, where mortal flesh was not able to persecute him. He spoke in this way: 'A short time remains for me to be with you, since I will soon return to him who sent me. Then you will look for me when I am gone, and you will not find me, and it will not be possible to follow where I am going.' Our Lord Jesus said this in a rather veiled way, as he often said many things, so they would not be understood until they had been accomplished. Moreover, obscurity of speech arouses diligence in investigation, and the words carry more conviction when the facts become clear. It also served to produce general agreement that everything the Lord suffered he suffered for us intentionally, not accidentally; he suffered willingly, not under compulsion. For though these words were spoken to all, they particularly struck the attendants[42] sent by the Pharisees to seize Jesus, against whom they realized they could do nothing unless he was himself willing. And in quietly touching their secret awareness, he showed clearly that he knows everything, however hidden away it is in human hearts; and at the same time by his kindliness he won over their hearts because he did not betray their sinful undertaking to the people.

Since the crowd did not understand these words, they discussed them among themselves. 'What is the meaning of what he said, "Where I go you cannot come"? Is he going to slip away secretly and go into some distant part of the world? Will he endure to leave this holy land and holy people and live his life among sinful and unbelieving peoples where he does not think we will follow, or will he be a wanderer and roam among far-off scattered races so that he cannot be found by us? For otherwise what does it mean, "You will seek me and not find me," and "Where I am you cannot come"?'

Now the last day of the festival had arrived, which was always celebrated with the greatest crowds and the greatest devoutness, after which everyone was glad to return to his own home. Jesus was standing in the temple as if he too was about to leave the district of Judea; he hallowed the most important day of the great festival with a remarkable speech, and at the same time prepared a wayfarer's provision of gospel faith[43] for those who were about to start their journeys. This time he not only spoke openly but also raised his voice and shouted, making it clear that the subject was one that was important for everyone to hear. The Pharisees were deluding the simple-hearted people with their false and frigid religion, and keeping them snared in human rules and regulations. And actually the crowd admired almost nothing about Jesus except his miracles. Since they had not yet drunk of the gospel Spirit, they had not advanced very far. So he openly called everyone away from the frigid teachings of the Pharisees to himself, promising that if they once drank of the Spirit not only would they themselves attain the true gospel teaching but in their own preaching they would pour forth to others an abundant supply of wisdom. He said, 'I am the source of all saving wisdom. If anyone thirsts, there is no need to ask Moses, or the Pharisees, scribes, and priests. Let him come to me and drink from this source. And whoever believes in my words does drink.[44] So whoever believes in me and eagerly drinks in my words as Scripture bids, bearing witness to me, will not wither in unbelief; drinking the divine Spirit will bring forth in his heart an ever-flowing, abundant spring, so that from his innermost heart[45] flows forth no thin trickle, but gushing streams to water the dryness of the nations and produce a rich increase in the gospel.'[46]

By this riddle Jesus meant the rich and abundant Spirit which those who believed in him would later receive; and when it was received the apostles promptly began with great faith to preach the gospel philosophy to the world in different languages,[47] and to pour out the Spirit they had drunk from heaven into the hearts of all believers. For though at that time some of them[48] had perceived the elements of faith, the powerful and abundant Spirit had not been given[49] to anyone yet, because Jesus had not yet been glorified by death and resurrection,[50] nor ascended into heaven to sit at the right hand of the Father,[51] whence he would send the Spirit to the apostles. First the mystery of the cross had to be accomplished, which could not be accomplished unless the glory was temporarily hidden; and they could not have had the capacity for that divine Spirit if they had not been trained for it beforehand by many miracles and many words and deeds. So our Lord Jesus invites everyone to this source of living water; he neither forces anyone against his will nor shuts out anyone, as long as he comes thirsty.[52]

When our Lord Jesus had said this and more of the same kind, though the crowd did not yet understand it all fully, they had a variety of reactions. Some said, in light of so many miracles and so much authority in his words, 'This man is really a prophet.' Others, regarding him even more highly, said, 'No, he is the messiah that the prophets promised in their predictions.' On the other hand, some, corrupted by the Pharisees' yeast,[53] tried to refute the opinions of these people from the very words of the prophets, which had foretold that the messiah would come from the tribe of Judah and the town of Bethlehem. Christ was thought by most people to have been born in the city of Nazareth, because he was brought up there and had parents there, and because he began his preaching in Galilee and spent most of his time there. In fact the citizens of Jerusalem and the Jews of the tribe of Judah considered the Galileans, being neighbours to the gentiles and mixed with them, as half pagans, because they were not known for their learning in the law and had never had a prophet of whom they could properly boast. They said that the messiah had been promised to the tribe of Judah, not to the Galileans, from the seed of David, who had had his palace at Jerusalem; so they claimed the glory of the coming Christ for themselves, and they persecuted him when he did come, for they were corrupted by jealousy. So they said, 'It is not likely that this man is the messiah, if you consider the prophecies. When Christ comes, is he going to come to us from Galilee, as this Nazarene has? Doesn't the prophecy in Scripture clearly say that the messiah will come from the seed of David, who was of course from the tribe of Judah? Why, it even adds the name of his birthplace – it says that he will be born in Bethlehem, which is the city of David, of the tribe of Judah. So when the prophecy clearly says that he will come from royal seed, from the holiest tribe of all Judea, from a royal city, how does it fit for this man to appear as the messiah, since he comes to us from obscure parents, and from an obscure town of the insignificant region of Galilee?'[54]

In this fashion the crowd argued their various opinions about Jesus. Jesus did not involve himself in the argument, for they were not disagreeing from such purity of motive that they deserved to be instructed, and the time had not yet come when he would make known his true greatness. For if they had really longed to know who he was, they themselves could have learned from Jesus' relatives that he had not been born in Nazareth, as most of them thought, but in Bethlehem, and that he traced his descent from David. Quite a few of them knew this, but since Jesus did not offer what suited their lusts they preferred to serve their own inclinations rather than recognize him. For if their heart had been simple and honest, they might even have asked Jesus himself and found out the things they were quarrelling about among themselves. Furthermore, there were some in the crowd whom jealousy and hatred had so blinded that they planned among themselves to lay hands on our Lord Jesus. But human malice had no power against him who has everything in his power.[55]

So the guards whom the Pharisees had sent as agents of their own madness to seize Jesus had a change of heart and went back to those who were waiting with savage hearts for him to be captured and brought to them so that they could finally satisfy their hatred for him. And the plan of God, which far surpasses all human wisdom, brought it about in a marvellous way that whatever the malice of the Pharisees plotted fell back on their own heads[56] and turned out to Jesus' glory. The ignorant crowd, uneducated Galileans, Samaritans, Canaanites, gentiles, were moved by Jesus' words and miracles and believed in him. Only the scribes, Pharisees, elders, and priests, in whose hands the business of the entire law and religion rested, not only were not moved to repentance but were actually made more savage in every way. Even more than that, the guards, an ungentle class of people and for hire for any kind of misdeed, both bore honest witness to Jesus and gave evidence of the Pharisees' incurable blindness. They had seen no miracles done, they had only heard him saying a few things; but they changed their minds, flouted the Pharisees' orders, and came back without arresting Jesus. When the Pharisees demanded to know why they had not followed instructions, they did not make fear of the crowd their excuse or use other reasons that they could have invented; they honestly admitted that they had gone up to Jesus intending to arrest him but that they had been so bewitched and transformed by his brief but effective words that their hearts resisted and they were not able to carry out what they had planned. They said, 'We have never heard a man speaking as that one speaks. Who could lay violent hands on such men?' What evidence could have been brought in the synagogue that would burden and betray the Pharisees' stubborn malice more? They were doing everything they could to overthrow Jesus' teaching, but their attempt had the opposite effect: while they strove in every way possible to stamp it out, they strengthened and clarified it.[57]

Nonetheless they still concealed the rage in their hearts, and speaking to their servants more mildly[58] than the madness of their thoughts warranted, they said, 'What happened? Surely you also, our men and not part of the general crowd, have not been led astray by him! Don't you know he is an impostor? If he were genuine, don't you think that men of great learning and unsurpassed authority would have approved his words? Do you now see anyone of the upper class, in whose hands the religious authority rests, or anyone of the Pharisees, in whose hands the precise knowledge of the law rests, who has been persuaded by his words? Or are you moved by the example of persons from the very dregs of the common people? That uneducated mob, ignorant of the law, is cursed before God.' All this took place by God's dispensation to teach us convincingly that nothing more stubbornly opposes true religion than the malice of those who are imbued with the forms of a false religion; no one is a more deadly enemy of the gospel teaching than one who skews sacred Scripture to his own base passions, and none are more hopelessly sinful than those fortified against the gospel truth by the appearance of godliness, the conviction of learning, and the respect of the people. But whatever this world with all its schemes attempts against the heavenly truth accrues to the glory of Jesus Christ our Lord.

Now reflect with me, thoughtful reader, that nowhere is there a greater shortage of those who wholeheartedly support Christian truth than among the highest ranks of religion and learning.[59] In a meeting of so many Pharisees, scribes, elders, and priests, there was no one except only

Nicodemus to defend the blameless Lord against such criminal contrivances. He was the one of the leaders of the Pharisaic sect, dull, to be sure, and not as learned as the others but with a less spoiled mind,[60] who had come to Jesus by night, out of fear of the Jews, as we described before, to learn something more definite from him in a private conversation. From that meeting he had advanced to the point of thinking Jesus was a good man, though he had not fully understood the mystery in his words. Nicodemus saw them aiming at Jesus' death with murderous hearts, but his support for the cause of innocence was limited by his fear of their malice, armed as it was with authority. So he tempered his defence, saying on Jesus' behalf the things that could be said on behalf of any evildoer who was not yet found guilty:[61] 'We profess the law, which does not condemn even a criminal without a hearing and investigation of the things the accused has done. Let at least this much of the law be granted to the man, the same thing that is common to all and is given by the law itself even to criminals.'

Since they had nothing to say to this fair and legitimate defence by Nicodemus, they not only did not repent or calm themselves, they scorned his authority and insulted him personally. 'Are you a Galilean too?' they said. 'There is some excuse for the common people and the uneducated, but aren't you, a leader and teacher of the law, ashamed to be a disciple of that Galilean impostor, whose only followers are the lowest among mankind and cursed before God? You claim knowledge of the law: search the Scriptures, and if you find anywhere that a prophet has come or ever will come[62] from Galilee, then believe that this man is a prophet.' The reply of the Pharisees was not only sinful but stupid. Now Nicodemus had not claimed that Jesus was a prophet, but that whoever he was, according to the law of the people he still should not be found guilty unless his case had been heard first. But there is no justice where jealousy and hatred have already taken hold of the mind.

After these remarks on both sides the meeting was dismissed and everyone went home, with the wicked purpose put off but not abandoned.[63] For Jesus' time had not yet come.

Chapter 8

And now that nightfall was near,[1] Jesus went to the Mount of Olives, where Bethany was, a welcome lodging for the Lord, since there was no quiet place in Jerusalem; in so doing he taught us that retreat is fitting for messengers of the gospel,[2] and that nowhere is there less room for the truth than in rich and prosperous cities.[3] Yet the preacher of the gospel philosophy will sometimes come to these too, not to pursue riches or honours but to benefit others, even at the risk of his own life. So the next day Jesus returned to the city at dawn and taught in the temple, not standing as he had on the day before, but sitting, showing openly that he did not fear the sinful plots of the Pharisees. All the people flocked to him, some drawn to wonder at him by his earlier miracles and conversations, some plotting and ready to seize an opportunity against him.

Now, since they had noticed in him an astounding mercy and gentleness towards common folk, the humble, and the suffering, from what ought to have made them love him they hunted for a handle[4] for an accusation. The law of Moses had decreed a stern punishment for adultery, that if a woman was caught having unlawful intercourse with a man not her husband, she should be stoned at the hands of the people.[5] And now the men indulged themselves and acted violently against women,[6] as if they themselves were innocent before God or were going to escape eternal punishment if, even though they committed graver sins, they had no penalties to pay under the law. For the law only penalizes public crimes.[7] It does not punish arrogance, disdain, envy, hatred; but God condemns these more than the things that the law punishes. So as Jesus was then sitting in the temple, they brought to him a woman taken in adultery – they themselves of course being firm adherents of justice and out of zeal for the law strict against offenders, though inside they were drunk with far worse vices. They set the woman in their midst so that if she were condemned by Christ's judgment some part of the crowd would lose their enthusiasm for him, since he had won popular approval chiefly by his mildness and gentleness; but if he found her innocent, as they expected he would, they would have a charge to level against him because contrary to Moses' rule he had not feared to free an adulteress.[8] They hoped that in the ensuing confusion he would be stoned to death instead of the woman. So then, being themselves much more criminal sinners, they accused the sinning woman before Jesus as before a judge. They said, 'This woman was just taken in adultery.[9] But in the law Moses commanded us to stone such persons. So we are handing her over to the people to be stoned, unless you disagree. What then is your judgment?'

But Jesus knew the secrets of human hearts, and nothing at all, no matter how hidden, escaped his awareness. In his divine wisdom he so eluded their wickedness that he snatched the sinner from the hands of those who would stone her. Yet he did not declare her innocent, lest he seem to abolish the law of Moses, necessarily applied to the control of wrongdoers, for he had come to complete the law, not abolish it.[10] Nor did he declare her guilty, because he had come into the world not to destroy sinners, but to save them.[11] Indeed, in the regulations that the world necessarily observes for the maintenance of public tranquillity, Jesus always so directs his words that he neither approves nor reproves but as the occasion arises warns that every wrongdoing must be shunned, not only those that are punished by the laws of princes; and that certainly in God's judgment there are worse crimes than these, crimes that the laws do not punish but that cannot escape the punishment of an avenging God. So Jesus neither refused the case put before him, since he is the judge of all, nor did he sentence the guilty woman to the people already girded up to stone her, and he did not release her from the case, since she had earned a penalty. In silence he made his defence of the woman who was being rushed to punishment, so that she might be saved for penitence and might repent for salvation. He did not answer in words, but he said more by his very act. He realized that the woman was a guilty sinner, but he knew that her accusers, who wanted to appear just, were much more criminal than she. He did not abolish the law of Moses, but he displayed the mercy of the gospel law that he himself established. He warned those who were dragging the guilty woman to their cruel punishment to sink down within themselves[12] and examine their own conscience in light of divine law, and he warned each person to behave towards his fallen neighbour as he wished to find God his judge behaving towards himself.[13] Teaching us in this very act, our Lord Jesus stooped down, indicating that each person must put off the disdain and haughtiness with which he flatters himself and in pride of heart looks down on his neighbour, and must sink down within himself. And stooping he wrote on the ground, reminding us of the gospel law by which God will judge us all. The law written on tablets made them proud and arrogant in their false justice; the law written on the ground makes everyone meek and merciful to his neighbour, mindful of his own weakness.[14]

But when the Jews pressed him to declare his judgment, though he had already declared it in his action, Jesus stood up. Standing there he stated it plainly, since they did not understand what he was doing. 'If anyone among you is free from sin,[15] let him be the first to throw a stone at her.' In saying this he did not absolve the guilty woman, but he did strike the conscience of everyone. Furthermore, all those who knew themselves guilty feared that Jesus, to whom, as they saw, even hidden things were perfectly well known, would bring their wrongdoings into public view. When he had thrust this barb into their hearts he stooped and wrote on the ground again, in the deed portraying what he wanted done by them. He was censuring the arrogance of those who asserted their own sanctity when they were far more criminal than those whom the law punished with a dreadful punishment. For she whom they had led out to be stoned at the people's hands had not killed her husband but in the weakness of the flesh had made her body available to another man. They, on the other hand, full of envy, hatred, slander, greed, ambition, and deceit, were planning to kill the Lord of the whole law, him who alone of all was free and pure from every sin.

At this answer from the Lord, then, all who knew themselves guilty and feared exposure[16] went out of the temple, elders, Pharisees and scribes, priests and other leaders first, and the rest following behind.[17] For those among them who seemed to be pillars of piety and justice[18] were drunk within with the greatest vices. After these had left, none of whom was without blame, Jesus alone remained, who alone was free from guilt. And now the sinning woman found him who had never sinned a merciful judge, when she had almost had savage executioners in those who were themselves in bondage to worse offences. So, fearing their savagery, the wretched sinner remained alone with Jesus, a dying woman with her saviour, a sinner with the source of all sanctity. She trembled with the knowledge of her guilt, but Jesus' mercy, which showed itself on his very face, offered good hope. And in the mean time the Lord was writing on the ground, as if doing something else, so that the others should clearly have fled not out of fear of the Lord's threats but condemned by their own guilty knowledge.[19] At last our Lord Jesus stood up, and when he saw that the place was deserted and the woman alone and frightened, addressing her gently he said, 'Woman, where are the people who were accusing you? Has no one condemned you?' She answered, 'No one, Lord.' Then Jesus said, 'And I am not going to be harsher than they, and condemn one whom they left uncondemned, for I came to save everyone. The severity of the law inflicts punishment as a deterrent; the grace of the gospel does not seek the death of a sinner but rather that he repent and live.[20] So go and do not sin any longer.' In this example our Lord Jesus taught those who declare themselves pastors of the people and teachers of the gospel how much gentleness and how much mildness they should use with those who through weakness fall into sin.[21] For when he in whom there was no sin at all showed himself so merciful towards a known sinner, how much gentleness ought bishops have towards wrongdoers when the bishops themselves are often in more need of God's mercy than those against whose errors they rage! Or if they are not held fast by equal faults, they certainly are not entirely pure from every stain of life; certainly in their human weakness they are capable of falling into every kind of fault.

So with the informers sent away and each one's crimes revealed to him and the sinning woman let go, Jesus used this incident to develop the conversation he had begun earlier.[22] Sins are darkness. Those who are true and simple and are eager to appear as exactly what they are[23] draw near to the light and are freed from the darkness, as the sinning woman approached

Jesus. But because she did not deny what she had done, she went away justified. On the other hand the leaders and Pharisees, since they wanted to appear just though they were really wicked,[24] shunned the light so that their disease would not be revealed and healed. So Jesus urges everyone, as each is covered with sins, to come to him, provided that he come penitent; let each follow Jesus rather than the Pharisees, who were the blind leading the blind;[25] and so that no one would be reluctant to approach out of awareness of his own misdeeds, Jesus has shown just now in the case of the adulteress how he does not keep anyone away who wishes to be healed. He said, 'I am for the entire world, not just for Palestine,[26] what the sun is to the whole world.[27] When the sun is taken away, everything at once grows dark. The sun shines on bodies; I illumine pure hearts. The sun supplies life and growth for all bodies, I provide the same thing much more readily for souls. Whoever walks with the sun to guide him does not stumble in the dark. Whoever follows me and trusts my teaching will no longer be stuck fast in the darkness of error and crime, but, cleansed from faults and enlightened by the gospel teaching, he will have the true light that provides life to the soul. For to be hidden in darkness is the mark of the dead; to walk in the light is the mark of the living. Knowledge of me is the soul's life. On the other hand sin and ignorance of me are everlasting death.'

The envy of the Pharisees did not endure this magnificent, though quite true, declaration from Christ about himself, especially because they realized they were being covertly censured, and because they thought that anything added to Jesus' glory was subtracted from their own. So they promptly raised an outcry against him, fearing that the crowd would abandon them and follow Jesus. And to lessen his credibility they charged him with lying. They said, 'You are a witness for yourself, and you make grand statements about yourself, but no one witnessing for himself should be believed. It is a sign of arrogance, not truth, to boast of one's own glory.[28] Therefore the witness that you bear for yourself is not true.' To an insult which, bitter as it was, could be more an obstacle to the salvation of the crowd[29] than a threat to his own glory, Jesus replied sternly, saying, 'It is true that among humans the testimony a person gives about himself has no weight, since he can both deceive and be deceived. I am not the only witness for myself: I can offer the witness of John about me, and the witness of the law and the prophets.[30] And yet if there were no human testimony about me (for I need no one's witness), if I were the only one to testify about myself, still, if you knew clearly who I am and from whom I have come, you could not refute my testimony. Those who are only human and speak about themselves in a human sense can be deceived and can even deliberately lie, and they ought therefore to have their testimony called into question. The same circumstances do not hold in my case. For I say nothing on my own authority, but on the authority of him from whom I have been sent, and I aim at nothing other than making his glory known. He cannot lie, and his witness alone is more unimpeachable than all human witness. And whoever has come from him and says everything as that one intends, in expectation of soon returning to the one from whom he came, has no need for human witness, since he is able to proclaim in his very actions who he is. But you are blinded by jealousy and you choose not to know what you could know;[31] since you judge me wrongly, forming your opinion on the things you see I have in common with other mortals, you do not notice where I have come from or where I am going. For that cannot be seen except when wicked desires have been removed and hearts judge according to the spirit, and when, from the things I do and say and from comparison with the sayings of the prophets, minds that are willing to believe see that the matter is a heavenly one, not a human one.

'But since you are corrupted by worldly desires you judge in an unspiritual way, to your own hurt sinfully condemning what you ought to have embraced for eternal salvation. Therefore since your judgment does not come from God but from human lusts, it is corrupt and false. But I judge no one. For it is not yet time for judgment,[32] but for bringing salvation. And yet if I did judge you, my judgment would be true, since it does not differ from God's judgment. For I would not be passing sentence by myself, but I and the Father who sent me together would pronounce the same sentence, since we have the same will in all things. In human cases the judgment of several has more weight than that of a single person, but the judgment of God alone prevails over the judgment of the entire human race. If you despise my judgment as being the judgment of a human being, you surely cannot despise the judgment of God, even if he does judge alone. But if you do not despise the judgment of God, you cannot reject mine either, since it agrees with his in all points, unless you mean to inflict a joint insult on us both, on him who sent me as well as on me who was sent by him. I say and do nothing but what he commanded.

'Likewise among humans the witness of several is weightier than that of a few, and according to your law testimony is only accepted if it is from two. And also it has more weight if someone testifies about another than if he testifies about himself. Yet it cannot be denied that among humans judgments are often false, and so is testimony, even if a thousand men – but merely men – agree, either because through error they do not know the truth, or because they are corrupted by desires and deliver a verdict not according to the correct judgment of their heart but according to its debased lusts. But when only one makes a pronouncement about himself, if what he testifies about himself he declares not on his own authority but on God's, his judgment and witness must be true, since God cannot be deceived or corrupted. I bear witness about myself, but on the authority of the Father, who himself also bears witness about me, and I declare nothing about myself other than what he has testified, for he sent me into the world to be a witness to the truth which he alone knows. If you reject my witness, you must also reject his. If you repeal my judgment you must also oppose him. We are two,[33] but the witness of the two is the same and their judgment is the same. Yet of the two there is one who is such that if he were the only one his judgment would still be irrefutable. But if you ask when the Father gave witness about me, he gave witness in your law, and you would recognize his voice if you understood with uncorrupted hearts what is written. He gave witness about me at the Jordan, he is giving witness in the very deeds you see him do through me, and finally, when the time comes, he will glorify me with still clearer witness.'

After he said this, since the Jews had several times heard the word 'father,' from whom he had come and with whose authority he defended himself, they wondered if he were speaking so grandly about the carpenter Joseph, whose son he was at that time popularly believed to be. If he did not mean Joseph, they wanted to fish out who that other father was from whom he had come and to whom he was going. 'Where is that father of yours,' they said, 'about whom you are saying such wonderful things?' But Jesus hinted that he was not yet known to them in his divine nature, since they did not suspect he was anything other than a man; and yet they would have believed in him and loved him as a man if their judgment had not been flawed by unspiritual desires. He implied, furthermore, that the Father is not truly known except through the Son and the Son is not fully known except when the Father is known, for the Son is not known by physical eyes but by faith, and the Father cannot be shown to human senses, but spiritually winds his way into devout hearts. He answered them in this way, 'You know neither me nor my Father, and as long as you are unwilling to know me you cannot know the Father. Believe in me and you will know both me and my Father. You say you know me because you know my birthplace and home, my parents and brothers. But that is not truly knowing the Son, for if you knew him fully you would not demand to be shown the Father;[34] if you knew the Son you would at the same time know my Father too.'[35]

Because such words were not understood, our Lord Jesus was powerfully stirring up the hearts of the Pharisees against himself by teaching openly in the temple, and in the most crowded place in the temple at that, the place called the Treasury because the offerings given to the temple are brought and kept there[36] (though all the things apparently consecrated to God were converted to the pleasure and profit of the priests and Pharisees). Yet no one laid a hand on him, not because they lacked the sinful will but because by God's assent the capability had not been given to them. For the time when Jesus had determined to suffer had not yet arrived, and he was not willing to suffer[37] until he had completed the teaching which the Father had given him to dispense for the salvation of humankind. So the Pharisees kept quiet, but continued to turn over in their hearts their sinful and murderous plans, while Jesus went on speaking, secretly piercing their inner thoughts, in the hope that in this way they would repent when they realized that nothing was hidden from him, a gift never given to a mere human. He said, 'No one's wickedness can hinder what I am doing at my Father's bidding. When I have completed it I am going to him who sent me, and then you will look for me in vain, and you will yearn for me when I am gone,[38] though you attack me and are envious of me when I am with you. Then you will know who I am from what has happened; you will wish for my presence and will not get it. Furthermore, if you who now persecute the herald of eternal truth persist in your unbelief,[39] you will die in your sin. For whoever stubbornly refuses the salvation freely offered dies by his own fault, and whoever spurns the source of life brings death upon himself. I do not go where your wickedness impels me, but I go willingly to a place where you cannot follow.' Our Lord Jesus hinted at much in this puzzling statement: first, that he would go to his death of his own free will; and then that through his death and resurrection he would be brought into heaven, where no one who is wise in the world's sense can be brought.[40]

Though the Jews were somewhat alarmed at these words and did not understand what they meant, they still did not dare to question him, but whispered among themselves, 'What is the threat that he has now made to us several times, that he will go away where we cannot follow? Is he going to do himself harm and kill himself, and get away from us that way?' Jesus, who knows all thoughts, fitted his answer to these ignorant and sinful mutterings so that what he said was not understood until his death, resurrection, and ascension into heaven were completed. For they did not suspect that Jesus was anything other than mortal, and could not imagine anything other than that he would die and so be freed from the troubles of his persecutors. But he meant that he had come from heaven, in accordance with his divine nature, and soon would conquer death and return to the place from which he had come. He said, 'Since you have come from the world you have the wisdom of the world and you speak in the world's unspiritual sense. I have not come from this world, and I speak of higher things than you can follow, and you will never follow them unless you abandon unbelief and show yourselves willing to be taught. That is why I said to you just now, and I repeat again and again: unless you throw off your wickedness you will die in your sins. There is a single way to escape the darkness of sin, if you accept the light; there is a single way to life, if you acknowledge him who alone gives freedom from death by the gospel faith. But if you stubbornly refuse to believe that I am he through whom the Father wants everyone to reach life and salvation,[41] you will die in your sins by your own fault.'

Even these words of our Lord Jesus did not sink into the hearts of the Pharisees, so far had this too well loved world blinded their minds. And so, just as if they had not yet seen or heard anything from which they could know who he was, they maliciously said to Jesus, 'Who are you?' But Jesus already knew that they would slander whatever he answered, since they were asking out of a wicked desire, and he also judged them to be more deserving of hearing what they themselves were than what he was. So he answered in this way:[42] 'You want to know who I am; believe. But you will not believe unless you throw off foolish and worldly desires; otherwise, even if I tell you who I am, I will tell you to your own hurt. For you will not only not become better, but since you are evil on many counts, you will become that much worse. Even the very thing I am saying to you now will be added to the sum of your condemnation. I desire the salvation of humankind, not its destruction. Otherwise I could say much about you and condemn you on many counts, but that was not what seemed best to my Father, who sent me into the world not so that the wicked would become worse but so that those who are wicked might repent and be saved.[43] The Father who sent me is truthful; if you believe in him you will reach salvation. And you will believe in him if you believe in me. You will be safe in believing in me, for I say to you nothing except what I heard from my Father, with whom I was before I came into the world. He commanded me to speak the truth, the truth that leads to the saving of humankind, not to its destruction. But if anyone is destroyed, he will be destroyed by his own fault for refusing the salvation offered him.'

But the Jews' blindness was so thick that though he had so often mentioned his Father, from whom he was sent and to whom he was going, and whose witness he had and from whom he had heard what he said, even so they did not yet understand that he was speaking of his heavenly Father;[44] they were still unable to believe there was anything beyond the human in him. For these words were being stored in the memory of his hearers like seeds, to bear fruit only when everything that the prophets had written about Jesus had been fulfilled. Until now it was useful for him to be believed to be a man, until the completion of that ultimate sacrifice on the altar of the cross for the salvation of the world. For so it had pleased the

Father that the glory of God be illuminated in his dying. Our Lord Jesus hinted at this now and continued to speak, suggesting in a puzzling statement that through them he would be nailed on the cross of his own free will. 'When you have lifted up the Son of man,' he said, 'then at last you will understand who I am,[45] and after you think that I am dead, then at last you will realize my power. In fact you will understand that the matter is not being done by human means but by the power of my Father, by whose will I do whatever I do on earth for the salvation of humankind, and I say nothing except as he intends.

'What is more, though I have been sent into the world by him, I still am not forsaken by him; he is always with me, speaking to you and acting upon you through me. For there is perfect unanimity between us. He is glorified through me and I in turn through him; but he is the source and I the delegate, carrying out my mission with the greatest fidelity, so that I am always doing what he has commanded and ordained. For Moses and David, whom you revere, said and did many things according to God's will, but they also sometimes offended him by their actions. I never differ with my Father's will.'

At that time no one understood these words fully. But there were several in the crowd to whom these remarks did not seem sinful, and some who took good hope from what Jesus promised and believed in him, though not completely[46] (for they were still untrained), but in so far as they were then able to grasp the gospel teaching. For some basis had now been laid for faith, though they had not yet achieved the level to which they were later to be advanced. So our Lord Jesus encouraged these people to be steadfast in that which they had somehow begun until they proceeded to perfect knowledge of him. For the faith of the good believes even what it does not understand.[47] The wickedness of the Pharisees would always proceed to something worse. He said, 'Do not let the example of those who are deliberately destroying themselves disturb you. You have done well to begin in any way to believe in my words; if the unbelief of others does not distract you from them and if you persevere in what you have begun, I will acknowledge[48] you as genuine and true disciples of mine, I who proclaim the heavenly truth, not the Pharisees' teachings. And as time passes you will know all truth, though up to now you have embraced the shadows of the Mosaic law[49] as true, and when you know the truth it will set you free.'

But the Jews did not understand what Jesus meant about the freedom of the gospel teaching, which does not change one's status in life,[50] freeing the body from the control of a master, but frees the spirit from sins, from base and worldly lusts, from the devil's tyranny, from fear of death, from the slavery of the Pharisees' regulations, and from the yoke of observing the letter of the law. They answered him in anger, for they were swollen with pride[51] over the fame of their ancestors. 'We are descendants of the patriarch Abraham,' they said, 'free-born men and the offspring of free-born men, and not only free-born but well-born too, and we have never been slaves to anyone. So what freedom are you promising to us, as if we were slaves to be emancipated?' This answer makes clear the stupidity of the Jewish nation, which put its trust and glory in unspiritual things and was heedless of the spiritual things that make us acceptable to God. They had purity firmly fixed in the washing of bodies, cups, and dishes,[52] though they had souls smeared with sins. They considered others worth little compared to themselves because they had a snippet of foreskin removed, though they had uncircumcised minds.[53] They thought themselves holy because they wore the law written on broad phylacteries, though to God the holy ones are those who have the law written on their minds and publish it in their deeds, not their dress.[54] So now they were transported with pride because they traced their blood descent from Abraham, just as if it were a great thing to be the offspring of saints, when with God the true nobility are those who, whatever their birth, display the character of saints. So when Jesus reproached them on two counts, both that they were ignorant of the truth and that they were slaves, they brushed off the former and took offence at the one that was minor and of less importance.[55] Indeed ignorance of the truth is the fault of the mind; to be a slave is a misfortune, not a misdeed.

So our Lord Jesus taught them plainly what he meant by slavery. 'You are offended,' he said, 'because I promise freedom, when in your own opinion you are free because you are free-born sons of Abraham. But there is another kind of slavery, far more disgraceful and destructive, from which no one is freed by nobility of birth, however great it may be. You do not have as a master a human from whom you must be emancipated; but I assure you positively that whoever commits sin makes himself a slave to sin and ceases to be his own master. Whoever is not in bondage to any shame is truly free and free-born. This is the free birth about which you could properly boast before God. But whoever is subject to sin has the devil for a master, and is led and driven at the devil's pleasure, even if he traces his descent from the holiest ancestors. For an individual's holiness cannot remove the enslavement of his descendants; each one is judged by his own deeds. A slave cannot bestow this freedom on a fellow slave, for he himself is also in bondage to sin;[56] only he who alone is not in bondage to any sin can make slaves free and even free-born. For though a slave does certain things in the house for the time being, still, because he is a slave, not an heir, he has no permanent authority, but is driven from the house when the master sees fit. But since the son is heir and master of the house, he has permanent authority[57] in the house, and he is not only himself truly free from all slavery but he can even bestow freedom on others. So if you desire this freedom there is no reason to expect it from Moses or the patriarchs or your priests, for their service was temporary, and none of them was free from all sin, and none of them had the authority to abolish sins, and none of them fully knew the truth.[58] But if anyone holds fast to the Son, to whom the entire and permanent power of the house has been given, then he can hope for true freedom, no matter whose offspring he is by blood. So Abraham did not beget you free, nor do Moses or the priests make you free by their sacrifices. If the Son makes you free from sin and error, you will be truly and fully free.

'You preen yourselves on the claim of being sons of Abraham. I know that you are blood descendants of Abraham, but that is a minor and commonplace boast, shared by all who are counted as Jews. If you wish to seem truly descendants of Abraham and not degenerate sons of a very holy father, show that you are his sons in your actions. For the mark of a free-born true offspring is to reflect the character of his parent. Abraham believed in God so much that at God's command he did not hesitate to sacrifice his only son Isaac, even though countless descendants had been promised to him through Isaac.[59] But look how far removed you are from your father's character: you are trying to kill me for no other reason except that you are blinded by the lusts of the world and the flesh, and do not understand my words because they are spiritual. Abraham never doubted the promises, and although his instincts cried out in protest he still believed in the angel through whom God spoke to him. As for me whom you see and through whom God speaks to you, promising greater things than he once promised to Abraham, you not only do not believe in me, but in your wicked schemes you even plot my murder. Then do not claim Abraham as your father. In God's eyes everyone is the son of him whose character and deeds he reflects.[60] For the parents' model that is observed at home passes into the character of the children.[61] In words and deeds I teach that I am the son of him who sent me. For I say what I saw and heard with my Father. You too are doing what you saw with your father.'

Since the Jews took offence at this remark of our Lord Jesus, they answered with the purpose of trying to provoke an insult against Abraham;[62] if that happened they would have called on the people to stone him. For when he openly declared that their works were evil and added that they were doing what they had seen with their father, and since they acknowledged no other father than Abraham, the patriarch was apparently being reproached in this remark for having the same character as his sons. But Jesus was not speaking excessively harshly of Abraham; he was drawing a different conclusion, that the Jews were not sons of Abraham precisely because they were quite unlike him. He said, 'If you wish to seem true sons of Abraham, reflect[63] your father in your actions; believe in the word of God. For Abraham earned the title of righteousness[64] because of his remarkable trust in God. Now though you boast endlessly about your father Abraham, you are still eager to kill me, an innocent man even if I were nothing but a man; and you want to kill me because I speak the truth to you, a truth which I do not invent on my own authority but which I have heard from God, so that whoever distrusts me necessarily also distrusts God. But Abraham will not acknowledge you as sons, for you are preparing a sinful act, one far different from his character. But if everyone is the son of him whose deeds he imitates, and your deeds are vastly different from those of Abraham, then you must have some other father, whoever he is, whose nature you are expressing.'

Becoming even angrier at these remarks, as if they already foresaw where our Lord Jesus' words were tending and what father he was designating for them, the Jews answered, 'What other father do you assign to us, since you take away our father Abraham? We are not the offspring of illicit lust. Surely we may boast of what is common to all Jews, that we are not only descendants of Abraham but sons of God, for God called Israel his first-born.[65] We too are Israelites. But if you take away our father Abraham, if you allot us some other father than God, the common father of our entire race, you are insulting not just us but the whole Jewish nation.'

Since this answer contained sinful shamelessness (for what was more shameless than for them to boast that they were sons of God when they knew that they were guilty of such crimes and when they were trying to entrap the Son of God and kill him?), he gave a stern, blunt reply: 'If God were your father, that is, if you were true, genuine Israelites,[66] you would love me as your brother and the child of the same father, one who reveals his father's nature, as befits a true son. For I reveal nothing other than God the Father, and I carry out no one else's business but my Father's, from whom I proceeded and came into this world. For I do not say or do anything on my own authority, and I did not appoint myself, but he whom you claim as your common father sent me. But if you speak the truth, why do you sons of the same Father not recognize the voice of him who is the true Son, and was with the Father before he came into the world, and speaks[67] nothing except as the Father commanded? Why are you so unable to endure my words when it is God who speaks through me?[68] If you believe that God is truthful, a doer of good deeds and bringer of salvation, the friend of the godly and enemy of the sinful, when you see nothing in my words and deeds that departs from these qualities, why do you not acknowledge the nature and character of your father?

'If you want to hear the name of your father, whose character and actions you reflect, you are not offspring of Abraham or of God but of the devil. You are his true sons; you breathe his character and nature and obey his will. For you hate the truth and you scheme murder for an innocent man. This is a deed typical of your father the devil. Indeed he was the prince and creator of lying and murder, for by his lie he enticed the first parents of the human race to death, moved by nothing but envy of another's happiness.[69] And the same disease is inciting you to murder an innocent man who does you good. The devil envied humankind created happy; you envy the restoration of humanity to the happiness from which it fell. The devil fell from truth through his pride, and fell without hope of repentance for the better; steadfast in evil, he heaps up sins on sins, now opposing God's truth through you, and doing through you the same thing he did at the beginning of the world, when he drew the first of the human race to death. Thus whoever hates the truth and loves a lie makes it clear enough from what father he is sprung. Whoever speaks a lie speaks it from him who is the source of all lies. Whatever the devil says, he lies, and he speaks on his own authority because he is not only a liar but the father and prince of lies. Just so, conversely, God is the source of all truth,[70] and whoever speaks the truth to the glory of God does not speak on his own authority but on God's.

'But if you are the offspring of God, the creator of truth, rather than offspring of the devil, the father of lies, then when I say to you the truth I have received from heaven, why do you sons of Abraham not believe in God? Why do you sons of God not recognize and love God's truth? If you detect any lie in my words, any wrongdoing in my actions, then distrust what I say. But who is there among all of you who can make any charge of sin against me stick?[71] You yourselves know what you are. But if everything that is upright and true is from God and you cannot prove anything in me that is different from the upright and true, why do you distrust me and in so doing distrust God, especially when you boast that you are sons of God? If your boast is true you would acknowledge the word of God; if it is false you are revealing your lying father. Anyone who is an offspring of God hears the words of God his Father like a true son. And the fact that you cannot endure to hear the truth that comes from him proves that you are not offspring of God the Father.'

The Jews were even more enraged by this sort of talk, and since it is usual for human wickedness, when it is boxed in by logic, to take refuge in wild cursing,[72] they answered, 'We are right, are we not, in our judgment of you, a judgment that you now illustrate in your action, confirming our opinion that you are a Samaritan and are possessed by a demon, though you want to seem to be a Jew and keep boasting that God is your Father?' What did most merciful Jesus reply to such mad abuse? Although the insult 'Samaritan' was commonly considered a great reproach, still, since it was nothing other than the abusive language of uncontrolled anger, just as if they had called him mushroom-head or onion-head,[73] he did not answer it at all. To the word 'demon-possessed' that they had aimed at him, he did reply, but in such a way that he did not return the insult, which could properly have been turned against them, but pushed it gently away from himself. In this he taught us that whenever it is a question of God's glory, whenever the gospel truth is to be defended against the wicked, we must be passionate and keen; whenever we ourselves are assailed with insults, we must display such mildness that we do not reply to everything but only refute those things which we cannot let pass in silence without endangering the growth of the gospel.[74] And it was important for the growth of the gospel that the people understand that whatever Christ did, he did not do on the authority of a demon but on that of God the Father. He said, 'I have no dealings with demons, and I do not boast that God is my father to get glory for myself from a lie, but so that through me my Father may be glorified among mortals. You boast that the same God is your father, but you still insult me, though I seek nothing but the glory of him whose worshippers you want to appear to be. I do not seek glory for myself among mortals, and your abuse does not harm me; instead, it brings destruction on you. For there is one who, as he desires to be glorified among mortals through me, also desires me in turn to have glory through him, not because either he or I need this glory but because it would be to your benefit in this way to avoid death and attain salvation. As for me, just as I am not a glory-seeker for myself, though my glory is the Father's glory, so I am not an avenger of insults to myself. But do not think for that reason that you insult me with impunity. For there is one who will both seek my glory and avenge my hurts unless you repent. The founder of your race Abraham will not help you, neither will Moses nor the priests nor the Pharisees, nor will God the Father, as you boast. You may be very sure that if anyone heeds my words, as I have often said, he will never see death. Belief alone is the road and entryway to immortality.'[75]

Though they ought to have been calmed by this very gentle answer, though they ought to have been invited to believe by this very great reward, nonetheless in accordance with their stupidity they took what had been said in a spiritual sense about the life of the soul as referring to the life of the body,[76] and, always eager to fan up any resentment of our Lord Jesus among the crowd, they rebelliously distorted to abuse of the patriarchs what had been said to educate them. They answered like this: 'From those words of yours we know even more definitely that you are possessed by a demon, and mad, and crazy, to promise to those who keep your word a thing that did not even befall our most honoured patriarchs, with whom God himself spoke. God spoke to Abraham, just as he did to the prophets. They heeded the words of God, and yet they are all dead. And you promise immortality to those who keep your teachings? With what effrontery do you promise to others what you do not have yourself? You, a mortal, are promising immortality to others? Are you greater than our father Abraham, who is dead? Why, all the prophets are dead. They did not dare to promise any such thing to anyone. What are you claiming for yourself? Who are you making yourself out to be? You are putting yourself ahead of Abraham and the prophets, and in promising what belongs to God, you are making yourself God.'

Our Lord Jesus so managed his answer to these wild insults of the Jews that, since they were not yet capable of so great a mystery, he did indeed hint that he was greater than the prophets and Abraham himself, and alone by divine power could provide what he promised, but he otherwise avoided the appearance of arrogance before the ignorant. He moderated his speech so as not to make people who were already upset even angrier. He said, 'I am not making any false claims for myself. For if in the human way I were seeking my own glory among humans, my glory would be lying and void. And if I wanted glory, there would be no need to pursue it among humans. For it is the Father, from whom all true glory comes, who glorifies me. The insults of humankind do not dishonour one who is glorified by God. And if you want to know who my Father is, he is the very one who you boast is also your God and father. If you were truly his sons you would recognize his delegate; if you were truly his worshippers, you would promote his glory and not abuse the one whom he sent into the world for the sake of your salvation. But as you worship him with false religion, so you falsely claim for yourself knowledge of him. He is spiritual, and you have nothing but unspiritual wisdom. But I, who am truly his Son, know him, because I make no false claim for myself but speak the truth. And if I were to say I do not know him, I would be as much a liar as you are dishonest when you claim that you know God, because you do not know him. I am sent from him, and I was with him before I came into the world. So I know him, and whatever command he has given me I keep. But whoever scorns my words scorns God, in whose name I faithfully carry out my mission. And whoever spurns the word of God does not know God or think that God is God.[77] As for your endless boasting of your father Abraham, whom you are quite unlike, and your stirring up envy of me on the grounds that I rank myself before him, I for my part do not boast of my own greatness, nor will I diminish his honour. I will only say that Abraham, whom you admire more than imitate, great as he was, rejoiced and thought that he would be blessed if it befell him to see my day. And he saw what he wished for, and this great man was overjoyed that it had befallen him to see my day, me whom you spurn.' In this puzzling remark Jesus indicated that when Abraham was preparing to sacrifice his son Isaac, through the spirit of prophecy he saw the Lord Jesus, who would be surrendered by the Father to the death of the cross for the salvation of the world, and yet would not perish in this death but after three days would come back to life and to immortality.[78]

The Jews did not yet understand this mystery, and again in their unspiritual understanding found fault with him, thinking that Jesus was only a man and had not existed before he was born from Mary. They said, 'You are not yet fifty years old and have you seen Abraham, dead now for generations?'

At last our Lord Jesus, as if provoked by their insults, revealed a flash of his divine nature, in which he knows neither time nor generations but has always been the same before all generations, as God the Father knows no time but always is what he is. For so he said to Moses, 'I am who I am,' meaning his eternity and his unchanging nature.[79] So using his Father's words the Son said, 'Again and again I assure you, though you do not yet believe me, before Abraham was born,[80] I am.'

At this remark, apparently openly blasphemous because a mortal man seemed to be laying claim to eternal existence, which properly belongs to God alone, they no longer held back their hands, but picking up stones they rushed forward to crush him with the rocks. But now that Jesus had declared himself God, to show that he was also a man he retreated from their rage. It was not that he feared their violence, which it was in his power to check, but he was teaching us that, when the occasion demands, the gospel truth must be preached vigorously and bravely; then when we have completed our duty, the madness of wicked people is not to be fruitlessly provoked. For our Lord Jesus knew that not even the disciples, not to say the ignorant crowd, could be convinced if he openly declared that he was God and man and that the same being was at once both mortal with respect to his human body and immortal with respect to his divine nature; in flesh a human born in time from a human, in divine power God from God existing forever before all time. For this impenetrable mystery had to be urged upon the world at the right time, by miracles, death, resurrection, ascension into heaven, and the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, rather than being baldly stated and imposed before its time on people who would not believe it. So Jesus removed himself from their rage and discreetly went out of the temple, in the very act rehearsing how the gospel light, rejected by sinful and wilfully blind Jews, would find a new home among the gentiles;[81] and how those who thought themselves the only upholders of religion would find their house abandoned and deserted, while Jesus, who alone is the source of true godliness, went elsewhere.

Chapter 9

So for the time being our Lord Jesus yielded to the madness of those who he saw still could not be healed, and set about showing his divine power in miracles, since he was not yet able to present it convincingly in words.[1] And at this point, a means of proof was promptly before him that was quite consistent with what had been done in the temple. The conflict there had certainly been with the blind, but the blind not in body but in spirit, which is the most unfortunate kind of blindness, and the more unfortunate because though they were more than blind they thought they could see, and consequently they were not only unfortunate but also incurable. For the blind man that Jesus saw as he went along was less wretched; only his physical sight was affected, and that from birth, so that while the affliction could not be cured by doctors it could be cured by Christ. The blind man did have the eyes of the mind.[2]

So when Jesus looked at this man as if pitying him for his misfortune, the disciples (who remembered that he had said to the healed paralytic,[3] 'Go, sin no more, lest some worse ill happen to you'[4]), supposing that every physical flaw comes from a fault of the spirit, asked regarding the blind man also, whose fault it was that he was born blind. For since no one could sin before he was born, anyone who is born with a physical disease or flaw seems to be punished for someone else's guilt, which would appear to be less than fair. 'Rabbi,' they said, 'why does this man suffer so great an evil as to be born blind? Was it from his own sin or his parents'?'

Jesus answered, 'He did nothing by any sin of his own to deserve being born blind, since he could not sin when he did not yet exist, and neither did his parents. For as the law teaches, God does not punish the children for the wrongs of the parents unless the sons imitate their parents' faults.[5] This man's blindness is the result of no one's fault but of some accident, as are many things that happen to many people in mortal life.[6] The reason that this man's misfortune was not prevented is that through him mankind would be shown the power and goodness of God,[7] against whom the blind Jews protest so stubbornly. The more incurable an ill is, the brighter will be the glory of its removal. I have been sent into the world for this purpose, to care for God's glory with deeds that can give unbelievers assurance that I am speaking the truth, so that those who believe may be healed of their blindness. I must zealously carry out this commandment while it is day. For people do whatever work they have to do in the light, since the night is useless for work. So now while the daylight makes it possible to do the work that concerns eternal salvation, there must be no flagging. For the night is on its way, when people will vainly want to do the work, and will not be able.

'As long as I am in the world, I am the light of the world. If people hurry to finish before sunset the work that they do for this life's needs, how much more should they all strive, while they have me with them, to carry out the task of their eternal salvation, for the sake of which I do everything that I am now doing in this world? For why else do I work except so that through the eyes of faith all may see and acknowledge God and his Son whom he sent into the world? In a little while I will go away;[8] then those who are now unwilling to work will yearn in vain for the light.' With these words our Lord Jesus covertly warned those present to cast aside unbelief and hasten to believe[9] in the Son of God, whom they would not see in the flesh much longer. When that happened, those who could not be led to believe in any other way except from hearing his words and seeing his miracles were going to long in vain for him when he was gone, though they had scorned him while he was with them and had shut their eyes to his light, which beamed into the eyes of all. Then those who hard-heartedly persisted in their self-willed blindness of mind would to their own hurt some day have to be abandoned to eternal destruction as hopelessly incurable, namely, when a wretched disaster would fall upon them that would destroy rather than heal them. In addition some day the dreadful judgment will come, when the wicked will wish in vain to do the work of their salvation and will not be permitted. For the night will not allow it because they neglected the daylight when it was permitted. What is more, everyone while in the life of the body, even after the elevation of Christ's body into heaven, still has Christ's light from the apostles and the sacred Scriptures, and these make it possible to do the work that concerns salvation. On the other hand, once the body is dead, that person's sun has then set,[10] and he can work no more, but must await the reward of his earlier works. Our Lord Jesus spoke at this time in a mysterious way, prodding people who were slow to believe with fear of the future.

But now as the disciples waited for the miracle, Jesus spat on the ground and mixing the spittle with the dust made mud; he applied it to the blind man's eyes, reflecting of course his Father's and more correctly his own workmanship, when he had formed the first human out of clay mixed with water.[11] Further, the restoration of what had been lost was the mark of the same creator who had fashioned what did not exist. And it is a mark of greater power to repair what is damaged than to bring forth what has never been born.[12] But now the novelty of this ointment made the hearts of all alert and attentive to contemplation of the coming miracle; and at the same time it proved the steadfast trust of the blind man, who made no protest to Jesus' rubbing the mud on his eyes but simply obeyed him while Jesus did as he pleased, not questioning the good result however it might be given.

The blind man did not instantly receive his sight, but was told to go, smeared with mud as he was, to the pool of Siloam and with the water there to wash off the mud smeared on his eyes. The reason was both so that the faith of the blind man, who made no protest to what he was told to do, would be clearer to all, and also so that the novelty of the spectacle as well as the delay involved in a journey of some length would call forth the greatest number of witnesses to the miracle.[13] For the blind man was sitting not far from the temple, begging at the side of the road, and the spring of Siloam, the source of the pool, is at the foot of Mount Zion;[14] Isaiah also makes mention of its waters and complains that they were scorned[15] [– so he was told to go there[16]] not because anyone obtained health from those waters but because they are an image of divine Scripture.[17] Although they flow calmly and gently far from the racket of worldly eloquence, nonetheless, since they bubble up from the hidden caverns of divine wisdom they have the heavenly power of dispelling the blindness of the human mind no matter how long-standing, and of opening the eyes by which God is seen, the sight of whom is bliss.[18] For 'Siloam' means 'sent' in the Syrian tongue.[19] For there is only one sent from the Father, who alone enlightens the minds of mortals. For that spring represented Christ himself, who even now in his might lying hidden in the mysteries of Scripture opens the eyes of the blind, if only they acknowledge their darkness.[20] Anyone who wants to receive light from Christ must be more than blind. Anyone who is wise in the ways of the world is too far from the hope of divine wisdom; anyone who thinks he can see and does not deign to have his eyes shut with Jesus' mud has no reason to hope for the light of the gospel. So when the blind man, well known among the people as born blind because of his begging, went there as instructed, doubtless a great crowd accompanied him on his way with mockery because with mud-caked eyes and so twice blind he was going to waters not famous for any miracle. On reaching the waters he washed the mud from his eyes and went back home open-eyed, able to see clearly.

And so when the neighbours and others[21] who knew him before (for he could not have been known to only a few, since he was a public beggar[22]) recognized his face but saw that his eyes were different, they said, 'Isn't he the one we saw sitting and begging at the side of the road in front of the temple?' Some said, 'He is the very one,' but others said, 'It is not he but someone else like him.' As they disagreed with each other the blind man himself said, 'Yes, I am that same beggar and the man blind from birth whom you have often seen,' so that recognition of his voice also created faith in the miracle. 'But we saw that you were blind,' they said, 'and now we see that your eyes are open and you can see. How does it happen that earlier your eyes were shut and now they are open?' 'The man called Jesus,' he said, 'made mud and applied it to my eyes; when he was done he said, "Go to the pool of Siloam and wash your eyes there." I went, I washed, and I can see.'

Then the people, looking for a reason to find fault with our Lord Jesus for doing some work on the Sabbath in preparing the mud and applying it to the man's eyes, asked where the man who had done this was. When he replied that he did not know who he was (for he only knew Jesus by name, not by sight), they brought him, the man who had been changed from being blind into one who could see, to the Pharisees, to tell his simple story to them and in that way betray Jesus for having broken the Sabbath. For it was the Sabbath when Jesus opened the blind man's eyes.

So the Pharisees again asked the man how he had become able to see from being blind.[23] He, fearing nothing and telling the story simply as it happened, said, 'He made mud with saliva and applied it to my eyes; I washed in Siloam as I was told, and now I can see.' When they heard this, some of the Pharisees said, 'This Jesus is not from God, though his talk is full of his father God. If he had God as his authority, he would not break the Sabbath with such deeds, since it was God who ordered the Sabbath to be kept. It is sacrilege to violate a holy day. God has no dealings with such persons.' So perversely not believing, since they could not deny such an obvious deed or condemn such a good one, they borrowed a slanderous accusation from the reverence owed the day. Others again, more apt to be healed, said, 'If this man were not pleasing to God and were condemned by God because of breaking the Sabbath, how could he do these miracles? The facts themselves say[24] that these things are done with God's help. And this is not the first miracle he has done.' In this fashion their opinions about Jesus differed.

So the Pharisees, who were grasping everywhere and anywhere for a handle to slander him, again addressed the former blind man. They said, 'What do you think about the man who opened your eyes?'[25] They were hunting for something they could throw up to those who took a moderate position about Jesus if the blind man spoke ill of him, as he knew[26] quite well they wanted him to do; but if he spoke well of him, they would make an attack on the man himself and expel him from the synagogue. But the beggar simply and fearlessly said what he thought of Jesus; he said, 'To me he seems to be a prophet,' meaning by this title a great and noteworthy man, of whose reputation he had heard and whose power he had experienced himself.

And there were quite a few Jews who could not be persuaded that this was the same man who had recently been sitting at the gates of the temple begging, blind from birth, since it was generally agreed that this man had open eyes and excellent vision. His parents were therefore summoned, who could identify their son by signs that only they would know. And here the spiteful inquisitiveness of the Pharisees contributed to both faith in what had been done and the glory of the deed.[27] They said, then, to the parents, 'Is this your son, who you have always said was born blind? And what happened, that now he can see?' The parents, timid as people of humble circumstances are, knowing that the Pharisees were hunting for a handle[28] for a slander, answered warily, 'What we know without question we can affirm: we know this is our son and we know he was born blind, but we do not know either the means or the agent of the restoration of his sight. He himself will give evidence on this more exactly than we can. For he is not a child, that he does not know what happened to him. He is of age; ask him, please, and let him say[29] what he knows.'

The parents said this not because they did not know what had happened to their son but because they preferred him to run the risk alone, rather than being involved with him in a common danger. For by now the Jews had made an agreement that whoever dared to proclaim that Jesus was the messiah would be banned from the synagogue, which was considered a great disgrace among the Jews. Hence it is also the harshest type of punishment among those who profess the gospel,[30] and as a result if anyone departs from what he professes and falls into some notorious wrongdoing, he is removed from association with the rest, so that shunned by the others he may repent out of shame since he could not be corrected by salutary warnings. But this type of merciful violence, which was proper to use only against those who made themselves abominable and pernicious by their faults, the Jews turned to the shoring up of their tyranny, just as they misapplied all the other good regulations to their own profit and ambition. For they were turning the weapon that ought to have been unleashed only against the wicked, and to heal rather than to destroy, against those who proclaimed Christ. Fearing this, the parents cast the onus of the evidence back on their son. 'He is of age,' they said; 'ask him your questions.'

So the former blind man was called back to be both witness and advocate for himself, and at the same time herald for the glory of Christ. For it is Jesus' way to turn all the malice of the Pharisees to the glory of God. The deed was too plain, partly in the parents' testimony and partly in the fact itself, to be ignored and denied. Nonetheless, in hopes of deflecting credit for the deed from Christ, whom they hated, they said, 'Do not credit Jesus with the fact that from being blind you have become able to see; you owe him nothing.[31] But give the glory of that good deed to God. For we know for a fact that this Jesus is an evil man, who has no dealings with God.' The Pharisees were trying to separate what could not be separated, that is, the glory of the Father from the glory of the Son; and they drew a veil of the greatest godliness over their sinfulness, as if they really were anxious that God not lose his glory, when in fact they were seeking their own glory in all things, heedless of the glory of God. To this the blind man replied both boldly and discreetly, 'Let others consider whether he is an evil man; it is not for me to judge. I can affirm one thing truly, which I learned from actual experience, that I once was blind and now I see.'

Since the Pharisees were given no suitable handle in this for either slandering Jesus or doing violence to the man, so discreetly and carefully had he spoken, they went back to their earlier line of questioning, hunting everywhere[32] for a way to rob Jesus of his glory. They said, 'What did he do to you, or what methods did he use to open your eyes?' They hoped that if the tale were told differently they might extract something with which to persuade him that the credit did not belong to Christ. In response to such shameless malice on the part of the Pharisees, the beggar, now more confident, said, 'I have just told you very plainly exactly how the situation is; you have heard it once. What is the purpose of repeating the same story? If you are asking with honest intentions, I have already explained the matter to you, and in my testimony fulfilled what was demanded of me; if not, it would be wrong to retell the same things. Or are you inquiring so carefully into the method of what he did so that when the matter is accurately known you too want to become disciples of one through whom God performs such great deeds, just as, once having experienced his power, I and many others are his disciples?'[33]

Angered at this great self-confidence on the part of the beggar, the Pharisees made no answer but poured out abuse, calling down on the man, as if it were the worst possible evil, the one thing by which they themselves could also be made happy,[34] and repulsing from themselves through an appeal to heaven what ought to have been sought for by fervent prayers, if they had not been as blind of heart as that beggar-evangelist had earlier been in body. They said, 'You evildoer, then be that evildoer's disciple. Heaven save us from such a teacher, for we are the disciples of Moses, to whom that Jesus of yours is not to be compared. For we know for a fact that God spoke to Moses, and that whatever he teaches us he teaches on God's authority. But why should we listen to your Jesus, when we do not know where he came from? Let him teach and prove his authority to us, and perhaps we will believe him.'

The beggar's faith grew in the course of the debate, and though he realized that they were devising destruction for Jesus with all their wiles, nonetheless, scorning all danger he argued Jesus' case, deducing and demonstrating[35] from the miracle of his restored sight that Jesus' origins were no mystery. 'I wonder,' he said, 'why you say you do not know where Jesus is from when it cannot be denied that it was through him that my eyes were opened, though they were closed even when I was born. Certainly it is beyond dispute, and you do not disagree, that God does not hear the prayers of sinners. But if anyone worships him devoutly and obeys the will of him whom he worships in reverence, God hears him.[36] If God took away my blindness through Jesus, even though the chief glory is given to God, still he at whose prayers God provided me with such a notable favour must be God's devout worshipper and friend.[37] And it is no commonplace or ordinary miracle that you see done in me. Many are the wonders told that God once did through our ancestors, holy men, not sinners. But if we go back to the creation of the world,[38] who has ever heard that there was anyone who opened the eyes of one born blind, pushing back everlasting darkness and letting in a flood of light? But if this Jesus had not come from God, if God's might had not been with him, he could have done nothing at all by himself. For what we see done is not within human power, yet done it was.'

The Pharisees were utterly enraged by the beggar's faith, and since there was now no hope that he would be either corrupted or frightened off and would stop preaching Jesus, they used their last resort. They berated him for his former blindness, they berated him for his humble station in life, as if these had been inflicted on him by heaven because of wrongdoing, and as if anyone who is born poor or blind or with some other physical flaw is born wicked.[39] They said, 'You were born altogether in sin, and you are teaching us, who uphold the citadel of religion and the keeping of the law? And you who a little while ago were begging for alms are now so bold as to philosophize here among such great men?' They did not allow him to speak any longer, and were embarrassed to have their mouths stopped by a poor and ignorant person. So they banned the man from the synagogue, as if we were the sinful student of a sinful teacher. But Christ welcomes into his church those whom the arrogance of the Pharisees has banned from the synagogue.[40] For to be shut off from the fellowship of the sinful is to be joined to Christ; to be condemned by those who in erecting their own false justice assault the true justice of God is to be approved; to be abused by those who in seeking their own glory strive to dim the glory of Jesus is the height of glory; and to be cursed by the accursed is to be dear to God.[41]

So the news reached Jesus about the herald of his glory and how bravely he had conducted himself before the Pharisees. For now the business about his being banned was being spread about by popular report. So when Jesus came upon him, to make the man's faith more evident to everyone, he said to him, 'You there,[42] do you believe in the Son of God?' For he had already declared before the Pharisees that he who had done such a great deed had come from God. And that fact was not unknown to our Lord Jesus, but he elicited the man's declaration on account of other people, providing a model for the others. But the former blind man, though he still did not know Jesus by sight, yet wanting passionately to know in this way too the one whom he called the Son of God said, 'Who is he, Lord,[43] so that if I recognize him I may believe in him?' He had believed in him even sight unseen; and these are not the words of a doubter, but of one burning to see the source of such a great good deed. So Jesus, indicating in simple words that he himself was the one of whom he spoke, said, 'He whom you wish to see you have already seen; and he who now speaks with you is the very one in whom you must believe.' At this the man did not hesitate but very quickly declared that he did believe, and as he spoke fell to Jesus' knees and worshipped him, surely proclaiming by the very act what he thought about him.[44]

Therefore, with the purpose of further kindling the hearts of the others present by this man's example, Jesus said, 'I, who am the light of the world,[45] came into the world for this reason, that the order of the universe might be overturned, and that once the illusion of pretended sanctity and of counterfeit knowledge has been revealed for what it is through the light of the gospel, those may see who before did not see, and those who now see may be blinded.' In this remark Jesus censured the perverted judgment of the Pharisees, who though they thought that they alone knew what religion is, what the law is, what justice is, were worse blind than any ordinary person, since they had the lusts of the world darkening their heart's judgment, while that blind pauper, humble and ignorant, just as he had been presented with physical sight, saw so well in spirit that he defeated even the assembly of the Pharisees themselves with the truth. And the sting in this speech did not go unnoticed by some of the Pharisees, who at that time accompanied Jesus not with honest intentions but rather grasping everywhere for a handle for an accusation.[46] These did not back off from their arrogance, but, either to wring a complimentary statement about themselves from the Lord or to have something with which to accuse him before the Pharisaic class, they said to him, 'Surely we are not blind too?'

But Jesus replied to this question, as treacherous as it was arrogant, in a way designed to show that those who think they are particularly endowed with sight are more than blind, for they are not physically but spiritually blind, and are the more incurably blind for thinking that they can see. 'If you were actually blind,' he said, 'and recognized your mind's ignorance, there would be pardon granted for your foolishness. But as it is, since you are in fact blind and yet claim honour for yourselves among the people for your learning, you are incurably blind. This blind man, because he recognized his physical flaw, reached the light; since you are blinded by the desires of your flesh and are wilfully blind, you cannot be healed; you continue in the sin of unbelief. Meanwhile the ignorant, who before had no knowledge of the truth, having seen my miracles and heard my words, find the darkness gone and embrace the light of truth. Whoever claims for himself knowledge of the law, attacking him who is the meaning of the whole law, is more than blind and goes completely astray. Until now everyone has dwelt in shadows, and there is no way open to the light except through the gospel faith. The people receive their sight more easily because they do not think themselves so discerning, and if anything clouds their vision it is ignorance rather than malice. But those who though they are themselves twice blind proclaim themselves the teachers of the people, that is, guides for the blind,[47] are more disastrously and irremediably blind. For they do not come to the light themselves, and they make others go astray because of their false reputation and the appearance of learning and holiness.'

Chapter 10

And yet, being that kind of people, they were angry and resented our Lord Jesus for attracting the people to himself and calling them away from obedience to the Pharisees and priests. For since they could no longer protect their own authority with respectable justifications, they hastened to defend their tyranny with deceit, terrorization, entrapment, threats, and wicked conspiracies, not serving the good of the people, as was right for those who called themselves teachers of the people and leaders and shepherds, but seeking their own advantage to the detriment of the people.[1] Now Jesus had earlier used many metaphors[2] to invite everyone to himself: calling himself once heavenly bread, the partaker of which would live forever; another time living water, the drinker of which would produce in himself a spring of water bubbling forth into eternal life; and again the light of the world that enlightens the minds of all; and again the Son and deputy of God the Father, the believer in whom would attain everlasting salvation.[3] So at this point he did the same thing in another parable,[4] so that that which is the chief point of the whole of human salvation might settle more thoroughly and deeply in the minds of all, namely, that no one can be a leader and shepherd of the people unless he first himself is a sheep of Christ's, the true shepherd of all the sheep,[5] which are to be placed at his right hand on the last day.[6] And whoever is not a member of Christ is not Christ's sheep; and whoever puts this world and his own glory before Christ's glory is no member of Christ.[7] The Pharisees then, since they wanted to be shepherds without Christ, were robbers and thieves, not shepherds, although they laid proud claim to the name of shepherds. So, censuring these, he said, 'I assure you positively, whoever does not enter the sheepfold by the door but breaks in by some other way, by climbing over the pens or making an opening in the walls, is not a shepherd but a thief and a robber: a thief in that he steals something wrongfully; a robber in that he commits destructive violence.[8] On the other hand, whoever enters by the door, since he is not devising any deception on the sheep, is the shepherd. And when he wishes to come in by the door, the one who alone has the right to open the door will open to him. The sheep recognize and heed his voice, since it is the voice of the true shepherd, though they are panic-stricken at the voice of the thief and robber. For though the sheep is a simple-minded animal and dependent on the protection of another, they still recognize the voice of their shepherd, whose usefulness they know by experience, and they shudder at the voice of wolves, from whom they fear death. So when the shepherd enters the pen by the door he does not frighten the sheep but is recognized, and in turn recognizes his own sheep, to the extent that he can even call each one by name, and they when they are called obey the one who calls them. For they are called to pasture, not to slaughter. And they are called by a loving and familiar voice, they are not forced outdoors; he leads them in willing obedience into the pastures.

'And when, once led out of the pens in which they were confined, they come forth into the open fields, that true and well-known shepherd goes in front of his flock, lest they wander off; the flock follows him as he goes before. For he does not go ahead without speaking, but with his voice continually urges the sheep to follow and calls them back from straying. And they recognize the voice of their shepherd and guide themselves by it.[9] What is more, they do not follow the shepherd of another's flock, but shy away and run off from a stranger, because they recognize only their own shepherd's voice.'

In this riddle our Lord Jesus reproached the Jews,[10] scribes, priests, and leaders of the people, who were angry that there were many who preferred to stay close to Jesus rather than to them, who considered themselves the people's guides. Indeed, those who were swine or goats[11] did heed their voice. But those who were truly sheep, innocent of guile, simple, and harmless, recognized the voice of our Lord Jesus, who was the true shepherd to whom the doorkeeper, his Father,[12] had opened the door so that he could lead the sheep who obeyed him into the pastures of everlasting life.[13]

But when the Pharisees did not understand what this parable[14] meant, he saw fit to uncover it because he had spoken in a rather veiled way to make them more attentive and so that what was implanted by way of a metaphor would settle more deeply into the minds of his hearers.[15] He said, 'I assure you most definitely that I am the door of which I spoke, through which the sheep must go in and out if they wish to be safe. Whoever wishes to carry out the office of shepherd must enter here.[16] For it is not enough to have burst into the enclosure of the church[17] by just any way; it is not enough to have reached the title and rank of shepherd by any means whatever. There have been many of this kind,[18] who have broken into the sheepfold of the people of God by wrongful means with the intention not of feeding but of ravaging; yet since they have not entered through me, who am the door, they are not shepherds but thieves and robbers, greedy for gain and violent in their tyranny. But the swine and goats[19] who love this world have heard the voice of all those. On the other hand the sheep destined for the pastures of everlasting life and eager for the fodder of the gospel[20] have not listened to their voice because they are not true shepherds and the sheep do not hear the gospel voice in them. For their voice does not have a shepherd-like sound, but the sound of a thief and a wolf.

'I, I declare, am the door. There is no saving entry into the church and the heavenly kingdom except through me, whether you want to be a shepherd or a sheep. Whoever enters through me will attain everlasting salvation, and he will run no risk from thieves and robbers, but safe in this shepherd will go into the sheepfold to enjoy the blessed peace of contemplation and will go out into the pastures to proceed to the duties of love.[21] And nowhere will pastures be lacking but everywhere the material for doing good will be provided so that he may both benefit others and himself return to the fold fattened on good works. Hence you have one mark by which to distinguish a sheep from a goat, a true shepherd from a false one. You must beware of one who does not believe in me and yet makes himself out to be a shepherd of the people.[22] What is more, his voice will betray what he is, if the things that he says are not flavoured with the glory of God and the salvation of the people but with his own glory, with profit, with human cleverness, with tyranny. Let the sheep beware of this one, for he is a thief and a robber, not a shepherd, and the more dangerous because he counterfeits the character of a shepherd. But if the voice is not a clear enough proof, watch what they do. A thief comes for no other purpose than to steal, and to get a dishonest profit for himself from the misfortunes of a flock not his own. A robber comes for nothing else than to butcher and destroy and wield tyranny over the flock that he ought to have helped. It will be possible, then, to distinguish the true shepherd and the thief or robber by three pieces of evidence: if he does not enter by the door, that is, if he does not acknowledge me, through whom alone there is hope of eternal salvation; if he does not say things that are consistent with divine teaching; and if he looks elsewhere than to those things which concern the glory of God and the salvation of the people.

'If none of these is found in me; if the Father has opened the door, if I say things that agree with the intent of the law and the will of the Father, if I never hunt after profit or my own glory, but in obedience to the Father's will yearn for nothing else than the salvation of all, then know that I am the true shepherd, and recognize the one who sent me, recognize my voice and my goal. Those who boast that they are shepherds do so to get their own gain from your loss; it goes best for them when it is going worst for the flock. I have entered through the door and have come for no other purpose than that the sick sheep may be healed, the dead ones may live, and the living ones may be fattened on every kind of virtue. One who lives on the produce of his flock, who faithfully leads his sheep back to the pens and out to the pastures, who steals nothing and slaughters nothing, is considered to be a good shepherd. But the gospel shepherd far surpasses this standard. For not only does he not plunder the flock as a thief does or butcher the flock as a robber does, but he even pays with his own life to protect his sheep – so far is he from doing harm, in the interest of his own gain, to the flock entrusted to his charge or from destroying what he undertook to preserve. Then the others who boast that they are shepherds are wolves, not shepherds. But if you are looking for a model specimen of a good shepherd, I am the good shepherd, for I not only do not pursue my own advantage at the cost of harm to the flock, but I also freely bestow my benefits, and in contrast to those who injure the flock, I even expend my own life. That which a friend does not do for a friend I do for my sheep.[23]

'It is not possible to be a true shepherd unless one is free from every desire for private gain, and also disdains his own life whenever danger threatens the flock. For there are many things that injure the well-being of the flock. So whoever is a true shepherd, and has the care of the flock at heart for no other reason except that he loves the flock in obedience to him who handed them over to be preserved, not plundered or butchered – such a one protects the well-being of the flock even at the cost of his own life. In contrast, one who is a hireling and has undertaken the care of the flock to earn his own living, even if he cares faithfully for the flock while things are peaceful, still, if danger threatens his life, that is, if he sees a wolf rushing down, betrays the sheep and takes thought for his own life by running away, and leaves the flock to be scattered and savaged by the wolf. For what reason? For none other than that he is a hireling, not a shepherd. True love does not look for pay. Where the motive is pay, there love is either entirely lacking or is incomplete, and whatever duty is performed is not performed in the spirit of a true shepherd; but where the situation most needs a real shepherd the flock is betrayed because the hired shepherd runs away. Why? Because, by reasoning applied according to a human way of thinking, he considers it better for someone else's flock to be destroyed than for himself to come into mortal danger. And this man is actually a little better than those who play the wolf towards the flock themselves, the false shepherds.[24] For the hirelings are those who when things are going well take care of the flock faithfully enough, but still betray the flock to the wolf to be scattered and savaged in the face of some notable danger. For he thinks, "So what if they are lost? Nothing of mine is lost; my pay is safe, and if some of the pay is lost, I would rather lose it than fight it out with a wolf over somebody else's animals. Another flock will be found that I can oversee for pay if their master loses this one." For the death of the flock does not torment the heart of a hireling. And so it happens that at the same time the master loses what he particularly loves and the flock that could have been saved suffers destruction. So it is no wonder if the sheep of the gospel do not recognize the voice of such shepherds. The sheep are not to blame, but the wickedness of the shepherds.

'And there is no reason for anger if those whom the Father has drawn to him follow me and abandon the hired shepherds, the thieves and robbers. For they realize that I am in every way a good shepherd, even to the extent of paying with my own life. I acknowledge my sheep as handed over by the Father, to whom all that I have belongs, and in turn the sheep, drawn by the inspiration of the Father, acknowledge, love, and follow their shepherd, knowing that they have no hope of safety except through me. The Father acknowledges me as his true Son, and obedient to his will in all things; and I in turn acknowledge the Father, who desires all to be saved. At his command I pay with my life for the salvation of my sheep that he gave me to be saved, and I shall not make the mistake of allowing this world, or the prince of this world, the devil, to have any power over them while I am shepherd; but so that my own may be safe I myself shall give myself up to die, in this way to break the might of the wolf[25] and to snatch from his jaws the sheep who heed me.

'And it is not enough for either the Father's will or my love if I save those sheep of the Israelite people that the Father gave me to save first; my care extends further. There are also sheep in other nations, scattered and in bondage to the snares of wolves, thieves, and robbers, and I shall not rest until I bring these too back to the common fold.[26] And though they do not heed the voice of Moses or the prophets, all sheep destined for salvation will still recognize and heed my voice, for race does not preclude from salvation.

Whoever heeds the voice of the Son of God, who is the true shepherd, will be saved. Until now God's flock has been scattered, because of the great number of false shepherds. They all promise salvation, and each has his own voice, and each calls in a different direction. Then the shepherdless flock is scattered in every direction and is destroyed in many different ways. But as soon as they all hear me they will recognize the voice of the true shepherd and will come together from every corner of the world. And so there will be the same sheepfold for all, and there will be only one shepherd. Anyone who is outside this fold will not be able to be saved. Anyone who does not recognize this shepherd will suffer destruction. And so that the destruction will not be my fault, I carry out the role of the good shepherd even to the point of the loss of my life. The Father loses nothing, even if all creation perishes, for he lacks nothing; but because of his freely given love for the human race he sent his Son into the world to bestow on everyone, if possible, everlasting salvation.[27]

'What is more, since I am of the same mind as the Father, he loves me uniquely, as a son, not a hireling, for this reason, that of my own free will I pay with my life for the salvation of my Father's flock, so far am I from pursuing my own advantage by means of harm to the flock. Among humans love is supreme when a person does not remove himself at the approach of danger. I do more, for I give myself freely and willingly to death.[28] There are those who scheme against my life; their wickedness would have no power over me if I had not determined to meet death willingly for the salvation of my own. They do indeed have the will to murder, but they would not slay me if I were not willing. So they will not rob me of my life, but I shall willingly pay with my life for my sheep, to redeem eternal life for them by my death. Do not think that I voluntarily hand myself over to death unless, by my power when I wish it, I take up again the life voluntarily laid down. Therefore the glory of the true shepherd rests in this, that he freely meets death for the salvation of his flock when it is in his power to escape death if he wishes. There is no human force that can rob me of my life if I do not wish it; but I willingly pay it for the salvation of the flock. Others die when they do not want to, and once dead they do not return to life. Even though everyone can lay violent hands on himself to die a sinful death, he still cannot call life back into the body once it has slipped away. I have the power to do both, to release this soul from the body and to call the same soul back into this very body. If it seems unbelievable to you that anyone would willingly redeem another's life by his own death, yet so it seemed best to my Father, who sent me into the world to take charge of the business of human salvation in this way. I willingly and gladly obey the bidding of him who has the same will as I, and who gave me the power to do what I want.'

When Jesus had said these things, novel, unheard of, and far above ordinary human understanding, again there was a variety of opinions among the people. For many were saying what they had already said more than once, whenever he revealed their hidden plans or said or did anything beyond human powers: 'He has a demon, and is raving mad. For what he says is nonsensical. What good does it do to listen to him?' Others again were saying, 'No evil demon is responsible for these words. For they have an air of divine power, especially since his deeds agree with his words; as his words are, so are his actions. He says things that go beyond human understanding, but he also does things that go beyond human power.[29] Could a madman and one in bondage to an evil demon open the eyes of the blind? To blind one who can see is demons' work, but to open the eyes of one born blind is the work of divine power. Since there is general agreement that this man did do that, his words cannot come from a harmful demon, since it is agreed that his actions come from God the beneficent.'[30] Our Lord Jesus did not reply to this difference of opinion, teaching us that we must not always be arguing with the wicked, and that we must show what we can do by deeds more than by words; sometimes we must yield to the rage of evil people, and we should never forget the gentleness of the gospel.[31]

After this a holy day offered a new opportunity for contention. For it was nearly the feast day that they call Encaenia, for the restoration and renewal of the temple at Jerusalem after the Persian exile.[32] And Jesus was not absent from this festival, Jesus the renewer of the law and master builder of the new temple, which is the church. Furthermore, it was winter, the season that befitted the heart of those who burned with zeal for the frigid law, not with gospel love.[33] So now Jesus was not in the inner parts of the temple, but was strolling in the portico adjoining the temple, called the Porch of Solomon, so that the place itself said that the peacemaker[34] was there who would unite all things in heaven and earth. What is more, the author of the gospel law was strolling there, while the law of Moses was about to come to an end.[35]

So as he strolled there, the Jews surrounded him so he could not slip out, angered by many of his words and deeds and not entirely in agreement among themselves, some spitefully slandering everything, some suspecting from the words and deeds themselves that there was something in him higher than human power. But they attacked him in these terms: 'How long will you keep our minds in suspense with your ambiguous words and stir up rebellion among the people with this ambiguity? If you are the messiah we are waiting for, tell us plainly.' But Jesus, though he knew quite well that they were inquiring with evil intentions[36] about what they had often heard and could conclude from his very actions,[37] still replied gently, wishing rather to educate than irritate. 'What need would there be,' he said, 'for me to proclaim who I am so many times, especially since, if I do make the proclamation, you interpret the evidence of the truth as arrogance? If you had faith in me, I have already said[38] who I am; if you do not believe my words, you still cannot be in ignorance about what you want to know from me; no evidence is more certain than that from actions. You see my works, which, with you as my witnesses, I do in accordance with the will of my Father, not the will of a demon as some falsely assert. If these works seem worthy of God, believe that I am sent from him.

'But you believe neither my deeds nor my words, a fact whose cause is not myself, but your own dishonest and completely insincere heart. Those whose hearts are simple and not marred by the wickedness of this world believe my words, and like sheep recognize the voice of the good shepherd; and I in turn recognize them as my own, humble though they are in the world's eyes.[39] But you do not recognize my voice because you are not counted among my sheep, whose simplicity is willing to be taught, since you have hearts swollen with ambition, frothing with hatred, rotten with malice, poisoned with greed, and corrupted by all sorts of lusts of this world. If you cleansed your hearts of these evils, then surely you yourselves also would hear my voice, and not for nothing would you do it. For in the first place you would avoid the destruction that threatens all who rebel against the Son of God; and then you would attain everlasting life. Indeed, however simple and ignorant these sheep of mine may be in the world's view, still, while those who are considered great and happy in the world go to perdition, out of my bountifulness my sheep attain everlasting life, as long as they recognize me as their shepherd and follow me as their guide. Sheep are simple, harmless, unwarlike, deprived of all the protections of this world. Against them the world will rise with all its craft and might. But no power of Satan is going to be great enough to snatch them from my hands. The world has the authority of the Pharisees, the dignity of the priests; it has armed kings, governors, judges, courts, prisons, fetters, lashes, axes, goads,[40] exiles, executions, and everything that generally sends fear into even steadfast hearts. On the other hand it has wealth, pleasures, position, honour, and everything that generally corrupts hearts no matter how uncorrupted. The world uses all these crafts to tear my sheep from my hands, but as long as I protect them no one will be able to take them from me. Whatever the world devises turns out for the good of the sheep and the glory of my Father.

'We will not fight back with arms or with poisons; we will not return insult for insult; but without defences of this kind, we will yet win with a new kind. That one defence which the Father gave me[41] to guard my sheep is greater and more powerful than everything with which the world will attack me and mine. And the Father will not abandon me, nor will I abandon my sheep. What is in my hands is also in the Father's hands. But since no power of the world is great enough to tear anything from the hands of him who by his nod has power over everything, then neither can any created object tear from my hands what he gave me to preserve. As there is complete sharing of power between the Father and me, so there is entire agreement of will. Indeed, we are a unity, equally powerful, willing and not willing the same thing.'

The Jews, angered by these words and not enduring that Jesus should talk about his Father so often, under whose protection he made such grand promises, again[42] picked up stones to stone him. Yet no one attacked him, because the time had not yet come when he had determined to suffer the extreme penalty for the salvation of the human race. Instead he tried to check their rage with calming words: 'It is for vengeance against public evildoers,' he said, 'that the people's hands are generally armed with stones. I have bestowed on you in accordance with my Father's kindness this great quantity of good deeds: I taught the errant, I comforted the afflicted, I fed the hungry, I restored the maimed, I cleansed the lepers, I healed the sick, I set the demon-ridden free, I made the paralysed and shrunken stand upright, I dispelled fevers, I overcame every kind of disease and distress, I called the dead back to life, and my entire power and authority, which the Father gave me, was spent on helping you, and freely spent. In all these things, what in the world is there that you think deserves stoning? If the doer of good deeds is stoned, what will happen to the criminals and evildoers?'

Finally challenged to the point of either bringing out their charges or acknowledging their madness, the Jews said, in an attempt to veil their insanity with anything at all, 'We do not as a rule stone someone for his good deeds, but we think you deserve stoning for the most monstrous crime of all, blasphemy; and on this point we are following the authority of the law, which orders persons of this kind to be stoned to death. For who could bear it any longer that though you are a human being you make yourself out to be God, continually talking about your father God, as if we are not all sons of God[43] and as if you are a son of God in some new and unique way, so that you share all things with your Father! Is this not to lay claim to some sort of divinity? What is more, since God is one,[44] any mortal who lays claim to a share in the divine power is a lawbreaker and rebel against God's majesty.'

To the accusation thus aimed at him our Lord Jesus replied in such carefully balanced terms that he thrust the blame of blasphemy far from himself; he also avoided aggravating their madness by harsh words any further, and yet he claimed for himself with all modesty what he was obliged not to deny because he wanted it to be known to us. He said, 'You fix the accusation of blasphemy on me because I call God my Father. Is there not something greater written in your law, in fact in the Psalms, "I have spoken; you are gods and all sons of the most high"? If God himself has bestowed the honour of his name on those to whom the word of God was spoken, calling them not only sons of God but gods, yet without affront to the majesty of the one God, and if what is put forth in divine Scripture cannot be false, how can you hurl the charge of blasphemy at me because I call myself the Son of God, I, whom the Father has particularly sanctified and sent into the world so that through the Son everyone may achieve sanctity?[45] If God's conversation with mortals makes gods and sons of God out of mortals, does it seem intolerable to you if I call myself the Son of God, since I am myself the word of God,[46] and since I was with him before I came into the world, and have an equal share of all things with him? What I claim in my words is a small thing, actually something which belongs to many others also, on the warrant of Scripture.

'But it is more fitting to judge from my deeds what title is owed me. If my actions do not seem greater than is humanly possible, if they do not have the appearance of divine power, then do not believe that I am the Son of God, that in every way he and I agree. But if you do see God the Father bringing forward his power in me, if you do not want to have faith in my words, then certainly believe in the deeds themselves, which you see with your own eyes; and may I be thought a braggart if I do not fulfil in my deeds far more than I claim for myself in my words. If you weigh them with honest hearts, the result will be that you will have faith in my words too, doubting no longer that the Father is in me and I in the Father, because each is joined to the other in an indivisible union, while he does through me what he wills and I never depart from his command and example. Consequently, whoever believes in me believes in him; whoever rejects me rejects him.'

When the Jews heard these words, words by which they should have been corrected, they became angrier, and tried to lay hands on him, to finish what they had now tried to do in vain more than once.[47] But to show in several ways that he would suffer willingly when the time came, Jesus slipped out of their grasp. So when he had taught there long enough, Jesus yielded temporarily to the incurable madness of evil men.[48] He went back over the Jordan and returned to the place where John had first begun to baptize (for as we said he later changed his location and baptized by the waters of Shechem[49]). So Jesus stayed here in the desert, as if hating the wickedness of cities.[50] Here too many people from the neighbouring places streamed out to him; Jesus' reputation, and the words they had heard and miracles they had seen, had kindled their souls. And the very place itself suggested to them to compare Jesus, who had now given them sight of himself, with John, whom they had known before.[51] And when they thought about it, they remembered that John had been held in the highest regard, though he had preached nothing but the baptism of repentance, and without doing any miracles had gained so much respect for himself among the people that he was believed to be Christ. On the other hand, Jesus, in doing so many miracles, had proclaimed a power beyond human strength; he had so often stopped the mouths of the scribes and Pharisees with his wise and cogent answers; and lastly John himself had so often and so splendidly given witness about Jesus, openly admitting that he himself was not worthy to unfasten the straps of Jesus' sandal.[52] So they were saying to each other, 'John was trusted by the Jews though he did no miracles; this one then ought much more to be trusted, since he wins trust in his words by so many astounding wonders. And if too little credit was put in John's testimony about him earlier, now the situation itself makes clear[53] that his testimony was true, since Jesus does more than John promised about him.' And so, partly because of the witness of John, who had no little authority among the Jews, partly because of his words, full of divine wisdom, partly because of his deeds, testifying to his divine power, many believed that Jesus was the messiah, though the Pharisees, scribes, and priests persisted in their wickedness.

Chapter 11

And soon an opportunity presented itself to make the glory of Christ and the Father especially radiant and at the same time to provoke the wickedness of the Pharisees to the point of murder. To be exact, while Jesus was staying by the Jordan, a man by the name of Lazarus happened to fall sick in the village of Bethany. Bethany was the birthplace and home of both the sick man and his two sisters, Mary and Martha. Now Mary was the one who in notable witness to her love for Jesus anointed his head with expensive perfume while he was at a dinner-party, and after washing his feet with her tears dried them on her hair.[1] Hence a particular friendship existed between this family and our Lord Jesus. So when Lazarus was critically ill, his sisters, relying on the friendship they had had with Jesus, sent to him to report his friend's illness, not doubting that in accordance with his wonderful kindliness towards everyone he would come to help a friend in danger. The messengers said, 'Look, the man you love is ill.' For they thought it was enough to report the news to one who loved him, so they did not add a request.[2]

Jesus replied to them, 'The illness is not fatal, but has been allowed to happen so that the glory of God may shine forth through its occurrence,[3] and so that when the evil has been driven off by God's might, the Son of God may be glorified in the glory he shares with God.' Now Jesus loved Martha and Mary and their brother Lazarus, and yet Jesus permitted Lazarus to become sick and even to die, so that it would not seem intolerable to us, as if God were dissembling, when good people who practise true religion are afflicted with the disasters of this world. In fact either it is to the advantage of the sufferers that such things happen, or else they serve to make God's glory shine forth – not because God gets his glory from human ills, but because for the sake of mankind he regularly turns the evils that befall us by the law of the human condition or by chance either to our welfare or to his glory.[4] Even before it was reported Jesus was well aware of his friend's illness, but it was best that the minds of the disciples be prepared for the greatness of the coming miracle. So after news of his friend's illness was reported to him, Jesus did not set out immediately, but stayed on in the same place for two days longer, not indeed neglecting his friend's danger, but waiting for fuller evidence[5] of the miracle that would be performed, so that he who was himself soon going to die might rouse the hearts of his still feeble disciples to hope for resurrection.

Now out of fear the disciples said nothing, because having just slipped out of the grasp of the Jews, Jesus seemed to be safer in the desert; but he said to them, 'Let us go back into Judea.' When they heard the name Judea, the disciples remembered how fierce the Pharisees' hatred of him was and how often they had gathered up stones to stone him, how often they had tried to lay hands on him; they were afraid not only for the Lord but for themselves too.[6] For they had not yet received the Holy Spirit, and were following Jesus out of a human affection, they themselves too in their weakness shrinking from death. So, discouraging him from returning to Judea, they said, 'Lord, surely you haven't forgotten that a few days ago the Jews there would have stoned you if you had not slipped away? And will you go back there, putting yourself in certain danger?' But Jesus calmed their apprehension in a riddle, indicating that there was nothing to fear for those who cling to Christ, who is the light of the world. For night is filled with empty fears; daylight knows nothing of such terrors. He said, 'Aren't there twelve hours in the day? Night will not come before its time. In the mean time, whoever walks in the daylight does not stumble; indeed, the presence of the sun makes it possible for him to see and avoid obstacles. But whoever walks at night, when the sun is gone, stumbles because he is without light. I am the light of the world;[7] it is right for you to follow my lead, not to go in advance of the light. Do not be afraid ahead of time. As long as I shine on you, there is no danger. The night is coming when you will be removed from me and will be panic-stricken.'[8]

Having eased the apostles' apprehension with these words, Jesus disclosed the reason for the journey. 'Our friend Lazarus,' he said, 'is sleeping, so I am going to wake him from his sleep.' Distressed with fear,[9] and because they supposed that Jesus was talking not about death but about ordinary sleep, the disciples replied, 'Lord, if he is sleeping, there is no reason for you to go there; for sleep in sick people is usually a sign of returning health.'[10] The disciples shrank from returning to Judea, and therefore, as much as they could, they were curtailing his reasons for going. But Jesus was gradually preparing their hearts for contemplation of the coming miracle. For in the first place he had chosen to say 'sleeping' rather than 'dead' in order to show, in the fashion of Holy Scripture, hope of resurrection.[11] For those who are at rest and will live again are more truly asleep than dead. And it is not so easy for any one of us to awaken a sleeper as it was for the Lord to call the dead man back to life.[12] So when the disciples did not understand what he meant about sleeping and waking up, he said more openly, so they would know that nothing hidden was concealed from him: 'Lazarus is dead'; and he did not add anything about waking him, which was at the moment too boastful a thing to say. For he preferred that to be suggested rather than explained, and he preferred to perform rather than to promise, everywhere readying for us a model of right conduct.

But since he had said to those who had reported his friend's sickness that it was not fatal but had happened so that through it the glory of God and indeed of his Son might shine forth, he made a similar remark to his disciples, saying, 'I am glad that I was not there when my friend grew sick and died, for your sake, so that your faith, which I see is still feeble, may be strengthened by a plainer miracle. For if the sick man had improved when I was there, it could have seemed to be chance; if I had wakened him, only recently dead, at his sisters' request, the Pharisees, who find fault with everything, could have made out that it was a coma, not death. For it occasionally happens in some diseases that bodies unconscious for many hours come back to life. Now, since his death is certain, there will be fuller evidence for belief. So let us go to him.'[13] The journey was not to the disciples' liking because of the fear of the Jews that was deeply fixed in their hearts, and yet they could not deny the pious and weighty reason[14] for the trip. Still, Jesus, well aware of what was troubling the hearts of his disciples, had soothed even their fear with this consideration, his statement that they were going to Bethany, not to Jerusalem; even so, just the nearness of the place they feared frightened them in their weakness. So with the disciples anxious and saddened, yet not presuming to refuse the Lord's command, Thomas (who was called Didymus in Greek, the Twin in Latin[15]), weaker than the others, said to his fellow disciples, 'Then let us go, to die with him if it is settled so, since he is determined to lead himself and his followers into certain mortal danger when he could take thought for the safety of both himself and us.'[16]

So Jesus set out with his disciples for Bethany, and he found that Lazarus had already been buried four days earlier. Now Bethany was about two miles from Jerusalem; hence the apprehension of the disciples, and hence also the circumstance that resulted in his having more witnesses and observers of the miracle.[17] Indeed, because of the nearness of the place quite a few had gathered there from Jerusalem, out of a sense of duty, of course, to give their condolences to Mary and Martha on the passing of their brother. This type of duty was customarily offered out of respect even to the rich.[18]

When Martha, who was hurrying about with a certain earnestness,[19] learned from someone that Jesus was approaching, she went out to meet him; Mary stayed at home. So when Martha came within sight of Jesus, having formed some good hope of her brother's being called back to life, she said to him in a tearful voice, 'Lord, if you had not been away from us, my brother would not have died, for with a word you would have easily driven off the illness. And yet even now the matter is not entirely beyond hope; for I know that whatever you ask from God, he will deny you nothing, even if you ask for life for one dead and buried.' Martha said this not in a despairing spirit and yet not in a trusting one either.[20] So to strengthen her faith, Jesus said, 'Cheer up, your brother will live again.' Not even this promise was enough for Martha's heart, for, though she hoped passionately that her brother would live again, she could not help being afraid. She feared that, just as he had deceived her with an ambiguous answer in his reply to the messengers that the illness was not fatal, so now too something was hidden in his words that would mock her hope. 'I know,' she said, 'that my brother will live again, but only on the last day when we shall all rise again.' For many Jews believed that there would be this resurrection, especially those who belonged to the Pharisaic party.[21]

Jesus wanted to draw the woman's faith in and regard for himself to a higher level, and to make clear that he was the one who by his prayers not only could obtain from God life for a dead man (which was recorded as done by other holy men too), but that he himself was both source and author of giving and restoring life to all;[22] no death was to be feared by those who put their faith and hope in him, because even if death befell them, nothing could hurt one who clings to the source of all life. So he answered Martha like this: 'Martha, do you believe that by my prayers I can obtain life for your dead brother from my Father? Do you believe that your brother will live again with the others on the last day? But you must believe this too, that those who will rise again on the last day will come back to life through me, and that no one at all lives except by my gift, nor will anyone live again except through me, not only as regards the death of the body, which should not be very frightening, but as regards the death of the soul, which is greatly to be feared.[23] The soul that lives, lives through me, and the soul that comes back to life, comes back through me. For I myself am the source of resurrection and of life. Whoever holds fast to me in faith, even if he has died in the body, will live. And do not take this as said only about your brother; any mortal at all who has faith in me will not die forever, even if his body rests lifeless for the time being. Martha, do you believe what I am saying?' Martha, now entirely intent on her brother's return to life, did not reply to Jesus' words very precisely, but still declared in a general way how highly she thought of him.[24] She said, 'I believe, Lord.[25] I believe that you are the messiah, the Son of the living God, who, promised by the prophets and awaited now for many generations, are now come into the world.'

At these words Martha was told to go home and summon her sister Mary;[26] with her grief now calmed, eagerly and full of good hope, she left Jesus and hurried home. Calling her sister aside privately out of the throng of visitors, she whispered the happy news secretly in her ear: 'The Master is here,' she said, 'and is calling for you.' As soon as Mary knew that Jesus was coming and saw her sister more cheerful, she too formed some good hope, even if Jesus did seem to have come too late (for they had not interrupted him with messengers more often because they thought it sufficient if he knew about his friend's danger, leaving the rest to his discretion). So Mary, thinking that it was not for nothing that he was coming, got up without delay to go to meet him before he entered the house. This was the best way to arrange for the promulgation of the miracle. For it was useful that many Pharisees were there, who though they had paid a visit to Mary out of duty because of personal friendship, still hated Jesus. They of course would not have gone with Mary if they had known she was on her way to meet Jesus.[27] And so when the Jews who were in Mary's house offering condolences saw that she had gotten up so quickly and was leaving the house, they went with her, supposing that in an outburst of grief she was going to the tomb and would there slake her heart's sorrow with tears. Mary, going on ahead, found Jesus, who had not yet entered the walls of the town[28] but was lingering in the place where Martha had met him a little before. He was waiting there for Mary, whom he had bidden to be summoned, picking the place as suitable for doing the miracle because the tomb was not far from there, as it was the custom in those times to put the tombs of the dead close to public roads.[29]

When Mary came there, as soon as she caught sight of Jesus, full of grief as she was, she fell at Jesus' feet and in a tearful voice said the same thing her sister had said: 'Lord, if you had been here in time, my brother would not have died and we would be free from this wretched sorrow.' But when Jesus saw Mary completely caught up in grief and the Jews who accompanied her also weeping, he did not reason with her, as he had done with her sister Martha, with whom he had spoken without an attendant crowd;[30] nor did he make any promises, since now the time and place were at hand for performing what he had promised Martha. First he groaned in his spirit, and became distressed, displaying of course the reality of his human nature, while soon to give evidence of his divine might.[31] That he shuddered in his heart and that he was distressed were not pretended emotions; yet the important point was that he took these feelings to himself not from the weakness of nature but by his deliberate choice.[32] And the reasons for the others' tears and for Jesus' distress were not the same.[33] They mourned with a purely human emotion for the death of the body; Jesus rather was moved to indignation at the sins of mankind, through which so many souls were perishing. He was deeply troubled because of the insuperable unbelief of the Jews, who wept for the death of the body in the case of their friend, when they themselves in their souls were in bondage to eternal death and were not mourning for themselves. Jesus desired all people to come back to life from this death, and he was indignant that for many his teaching, his miracles, and his death would come to nothing.

So after he had given plain proof of his human nature in the shuddering of his spirit and the distress of his heart, in his face, his eyes, and the whole look of his body, now teaching us that there should be no succumbing to emotions of this kind or distraction from the things that concern power, he curbed his heart's distress[34] and said, 'Where have you laid him?' – not that he did not know, but so that he could exclude from the miracle any suspicion of deceit.[35] The relatives replied, 'Lord, come and see.' That remark indicated that the tomb was not far off, and now, as if his grief was renewed at being shown the grave, Jesus wept. Groaning and distress had come first, a mark of grief breaking in upon the heart. Tears are as it were the blood of the already wounded and vanquished heart; but these tears did not come from a vanquished heart. For they were not spent for the dead Lazarus, but for us, so that we might believe Jesus was truly a man, and at the same time we might learn how pitiable, how lamentable, is the death of the soul, though humankind neither loathes nor laments it.[36]

But the Jews believed that Jesus was affected in this way by nothing other than the death of a friend with whom he had had a close companionship, and they said, 'Look how dearly he loved Lazarus, since he mourns his death so, though he was not related to him by blood.' Yet there were those who turned to his discredit even the fact that by his tears he attested to no ordinary love for Lazarus, for they said, 'Didn't this man just recently open the eyes of a blind beggar with whom he had no friendship? Then why did he not prevent so great a friend of his from dying? If he didn't care to prevent it, why is he attesting to his untimely love now by his tears? If he could not do what is easier, how did he perform what is more difficult? Many times a doctor keeps a sick man alive; no one has ever opened the eyes of one born blind.'[37]

But Jesus was now close to the tomb. Wanting to show clearly that the state of a person long practised in sin is to be abhorred and how much repentance, how many tears are needed to reform and return to the life of innocence through the mercy of God, he again groaned and was distressed, demonstrating in himself, of course, a model of that which must be shown in us if we wish to reform from the evils to which we have been long accustomed.[38] And now they reached the tomb. It was a cave, the mouth of which was blocked by a rock placed over it, and this fact made for faith in the miracle and the exclusion of any suspicion of trickery.[39] So that their faith might be made even more sure if the deed were carried out not by his or his disciples' hands but by the hands of relatives[40] on whom no suspicion of trickery would fall, Jesus turned to the relatives and said, 'Remove the stone.' The simple-heartedness of Martha, the dead man's sister, also increased the certainty of the miracle. For at this point, forgetting what Jesus had promised her, because of Jesus' tears and sorrow she had returned to her earlier state of mind and had almost absorbed a certain lack of trust. She was afraid, indeed, that when the stone was removed the stench of the corpse would strike the nostrils of the bystanders, not realizing that he who at the resurrection was going to rouse the bodies of everyone, by then reduced to dust for many generations, could also raise a corpse only recently begun to decay.[41] 'Lord,' she said, 'by now he stinks.[42] For it is the fourth day that he is dead.' So Jesus fanned the faith of the wavering woman with a gentle scolding,[43] saying, 'Have you forgotten what I said to you just now, that if you believed, the glory of God would shine forth through your brother's death?'

So with everyone attending to the wonder of the strange business, at our Lord Jesus' bidding the stone was moved aside. And next, with everyone's minds and eyes attentive, our Lord Jesus looked up to heaven, to teach us that any great thing done by us must be credited to God as the source, and at the same time to make clear to the bystanders that whatever he did, he did by divine might;[44] he said, 'Father, I give you thanks because you have heard my prayer, not that this is unusual or occasional for me.

For I know that since your will and mine are the same, you always hear if I ask for anything from you. And neither do I want anything that you do not want; but I am saying these things because of the crowd of people standing here, so that when they see the miracle they may believe that whatever I do on earth, I do in accordance with your will, and because I have been sent into the world by you to make the glory of your name shine forth among mankind.' After he addressed this to his Father, he called the dead man out, shouting the name in a loud voice: 'Lazarus, come out here.' He could have brought it about with just a nod that the buried man returned to life and came out, but the great shout is the mark of the great power whereby the sinning soul that is far from God's sight, entombed in the darkness of wrongdoing and decaying in the filth of its sins, returns to life and comes out into the light of truth.[45]

And without delay, in the sight of all, he who had been dead and buried came out instantly at the sound of the one calling him. What is more, he came out with his body indeed intact but with all the grave-clothes, so that everyone would recognize that it was the very man whom they themselves had buried in such dress three days earlier.[46] For in funeral fashion his feet were bound with strips of cloth and his hands tied with grave-bands, and his face was wrapped in a towel. This in itself was a wonder, that the dead man had not begun only gradually to move and show signs of returning life, as is generally the case with others who we read were revived by holy men,[47] but promptly at the voice's bidding a man dead for four days came alive again, and, what makes the miracle greater, though bound and tied he came directly out from the deepest crannies of the cave.[48] Then Jesus, wanting nothing to be lacking for the fullest faith in the miracle, said to his friends,[49] 'Unbind him and let him go,' so that his movement and ready step would show that the man was in good health, not merely alive. Jesus could have made his bonds be loosed of their own accord. Instead, while the others carried out everything by their own efforts, with every piece of evidence they both excluded any suspicion of deceit and strengthened the certainty of the miracle. The sisters reported their brother's illness to Jesus through others while Jesus was away from them. While Jesus was away, the man died, was buried, and had been kept long enough for the onset of decay. He was mourned by the customary gathering of many people. His sisters themselves reported his death; in the presence of a crowd the grave was pointed out; the rock was moved away by others' hands; he who came out was unbound by others' hands. Nothing was left here for unbelievers to find fault with.[50] And once so notable a miracle was done, Jesus did not say a single boastful word about himself.[51] He did not reproach the crowd because they quite generally carped at his miracles. He did not force thanks from Lazarus or his sisters.

Then many who had come to Lazarus' sisters Mary and Martha out of duty, when they saw so remarkable a wonder, believed that he was the messiah, holding fast to the teaching of one whose mighty power they had seen in person. But some returned to Jerusalem and reported to the Pharisees what Jesus had done near Bethany. So when they heard of this remarkably wonderful deed, the chief priests and Pharisees – who for so plain a declaration of his divine power ought to have worshipped Jesus and given thanks to God[52] – spurred by the goads of envy, now no longer held themselves in check. Calling an unholy meeting so that the affair would seem to be done by lawful means, they consulted together about a method to meet such great danger. For though considerations of personal advantage and their sickness of soul drove them to raving against Jesus, who did good to all people, they still wanted this business to look as if it concerned the safety of the whole people.[53] 'What do you suggest should be done?' they said. 'This man does many marvellous things, and daily surpasses himself in doing miracles. If we allow him to go on as he has begun, the result will be that, just as now many of the people think highly of him, soon everyone will take him to be the messiah. If that happens and the story reaches the Romans that the Jewish nation has deserted Caesar and defected to a new king, since they are well aware that for a long time now the Jews have looked for a king as a liberator of his people, they will make a brutal armed attack on us. And then godless nations will seize this holy place and destroy the entire Jewish race in the bloodshed.'

Though this discussion was aiming at the execution of Jesus, the source of all salvation, on the pretext of public safety,[54] it still seemed to Caiaphas too slow and insipid. He was the chief priest of that year. For that office, as being soon to cease entirely, had ceased being for life; instead the priesthood was up for sale and was purchased annually by the leading men.[55] So he, more sinful than all the rest though he proclaimed himself the high priest of religion, berated their inaction because they were still considering in their sluggish councils whether Jesus was to be killed, when everything else should be put aside and that one thing should be done as quickly as possible. He said, 'You who sit here debating whether the doer of such deeds ought to be killed do not seem to understand the situation at all as it really is, and you do not consider that it is to everyone's benefit that this one man should die for the people instead of his being unharmed and the whole nation's being destroyed.' These remarks did not come from the heart of a chief priest who was criminally wicked and full of murder, but because of the priestly office he held, the spirit of prophecy sent forth through the mouth of a sinful man a sinless prediction, that it would come about that Jesus by his death would purchase the salvation of the Jewish nation. And he would not only make it possible for those of the Jews who believed to attain salvation, but also for those among the gentiles who lived in various parts of the whole world but who were destined some day to become children of God through the gospel faith to be gathered together into one, and for Indian, Ethiopian, Greek, Scythian, and Briton[56] to meet together in the fellowship of a united church.

So the Pharisees, encouraged by this remark of the wicked chief priest, now with fixed purpose determined on what they had earlier often attempted as the opportunity presented itself, the removal of Jesus from their midst by any means whatsoever, as if they were concerned for the safety of their state; and so that the deed would not be insufficiently impious, they veiled it in a pretext of piety,[57] thinking that now they had a reason that could even bestir the entire population to the public and legal murder of Jesus as one harmful to the whole Jewish nation. And there was no need for any charge to be levelled against him, or any fresh incident. Jesus then, whom nothing ever escaped, even though popular rumour had not conveyed to him the wickedness planned by the Pharisees and priests, played his human role as long as he was in Judea and stayed out of public view, not wanting to add fuel to the fire.[58] But he went off further from the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, the killer of prophets,[59] and entered the town of Ephraim, which was close to the desert, indicating in his very action that the sinful Jews would have to leave their synagogue, and a new people, who relied not on the fruitless works of the Mosaic law but on the faith of the gospel, would be gathered together into the church and would grow immeasurably from the smallest beginnings according to the omen of the Hebrew word; for Ephraim in Hebrew means 'growing.'[60] So Jesus stayed here with his handful of disciples, who, though they were dreadfully afraid for themselves too, still did not dare to desert the Lord.

But now too it was nearly the time determined by the Father when Christ would be sacrificed as the offering for the salvation of the human race. For the day most revered by the Jews was approaching, which they called Phase,[61] that is, Passover, the very name renewing for them the memory of the event, because once the blood of a lamb smeared on the doorposts saved the Hebrews from the sword of the angel who was destroying the Egyptians and passing over only those houses that had their doorposts marked with the lamb's blood.[62] And now many people from the various parts of Palestine were on their way to Jerusalem for the rapidly approaching festival, to celebrate there in holiness their most sacred day, according to the prescribed rituals. And so that we understand that nothing is more irreligious than the Jewish religion, which consists in things visible: while with great punctiliousness they were careful not to omit anything laid down by Moses or added by the Pharisees, on their holiest day of all they did not shrink from what is most sinful, that is, shedding the blood of an innocent man.[63] Now a large crowd was there, and Jesus was already known to many of them, for he regularly attended festivals of this sort. So they wondered why he was not there then, and standing in the temple they discussed among themselves what could be the reason that contrary to his custom Jesus was absent from so great a celebration. Yet he was not going to stay away, but wanting to come eagerly expected, he delayed till the time suited him. Also the priests and Pharisees, supposing that he was in hiding somewhere out of fear, had gone to some trouble and had even given official notice that if anyone knew where Jesus was hiding, he should inform them so Jesus could be arrested. With such holy rites the priests and Pharisees, leaders of religion and teachers of the Law, prepared themselves for the festival day, but all the while they were unknowingly arranging for the salvation of the whole world.

Chapter 12

Now Jesus knew that they had made a definite plan to kill him, and that the time was now at hand when he had freely decided to be sacrificed, a spotless lamb offered for the salvation of the world. So he did not wish to be in hiding any longer; but as if presenting himself for the slaughter,[1] on the seventh day[2] before the feast of Passover, when the Jewish custom is to enjoy a foretaste as it were of the Passover lamb in a rather elaborate meal,[3] he returned to Bethany, both to renew the memory of the recent miracle and to impress upon the hearts of his disciples the hope of resurrection, since he knew that they would be greatly upset at his death. For Lazarus, whom he had recalled to life a few days earlier, lived in Bethany. And the place was fairly well known because it was close to Jerusalem. So a meal was prepared for Jesus there;[4] Martha served him as he ate. What is more, Lazarus was one of the company of guests at that banquet; in this way everyone would be quite sure that it had been no ghost that had earlier been seen to go from his tomb to his home, since he had now lived for some days after his death, and had joined in conversation with others, and even taken food.[5]

Now Mary burned with an extraordinary love for the Lord Jesus, for many reasons but especially because of his recent kindness to her brother. So she went to the banquet, and as Jesus was at table she poured on his head[6] a great quantity of perfume, a full pound, of the most expensive kind, made from fine-quality nard; the fragrance of the perfume filled the whole house. And the woman's unheard-of love was not content with this; she anointed his feet with the perfume and bathed them with her tears and dried them with her hair.[7] It was not that she thought Jesus would be charmed by luxuries of this kind, for she knew his simple way of life, but her uncontrollable love yielded to its desire, unaware, in fact, of what it did. And yet in performing this service she announced Jesus' death and burial and played out an image of the church, which would embrace her Lord with divine honours when he was spurned by the synagogue.

The waste of this perfume stirred the hearts of the disciples and especially of Judas Iscariot; since the cash-box was entrusted to him as being the most worthless one of them all (so that the basest of men was steward of the basest business[8]), in the fashion of those who manage a common fund, he was in the habit of stealing something from it for himself. He did not depend wholeheartedly on Jesus' teaching but was already looking out for a nest-egg for himself on which he could live separately from Jesus' fellowship. So, grumbling about Mary, he said, 'What was the point of wasting such an expensive thing? For the Lord is not charmed by such luxuries, and this extravagance is not appropriate for our banquet. But if the woman was determined to make a gift of such a costly thing, it could have been presented and then sold and the money for it given to the poor. Surely that would have been more blessed and more worthy of our teacher and ourselves.' Though the rest of the apostles were sincerely saying these things too, in Judas' case while the words were similar the intention was far different.[9] For he had no concern for the business of the poor, but he held the cash-box, and what the unsolicited kindness of their friends contributed he kept watch over, but not honestly; and from it he stole a certain amount, already giving evidence about himself, how unsuited he was for stewardship of the gospel teaching, since lust for money[10] beset his soul.

But Jesus hushed the grumbling of the disciples without betraying Judas,[11] and he came to Mary's defence in a way that allowed him to indicate that he was going to die voluntarily. For our Lord Jesus wanted everyone to be convinced of this in particular, that he met his death for the salvation of the human race not by human violence but of his own free will, in the manner and at the time he chose. 'Do not grumble[12] at this woman's service,' he said. 'This expenditure is not going to waste, but the honour she has done is credited to my burial, which she now anticipates,[13] since there will be no opportunity then for perfuming. You think well of me because in my lifetime I have always rejected luxuries of this kind, but I wish my death and burial to be honoured. Do not begrudge me this honour, which is expended on me now that I am on the point of departing. You will always have available ordinary poor people whose wants you can supply; my availability will be brief.'

Further, since Bethany was crowded with citizens of Jerusalem because it was nearby, and since Lazarus, known to many because of his family and wealth,[14] was even better known to many because of the report of the recent miracle, it was no secret that Jesus was in Bethany. And soon a great number of people had streamed there from the city, partly to see Jesus, whose fame had been greatly increased by so notable a miracle, and partly so they could catch sight of Lazarus himself, who, they had heard, had been raised from the dead. This was urged on them by the innate curiosity of the mortal mind. Besides, jealousy and hatred of Jesus had so blinded the hearts of the priests and Pharisees that now it did not satisfy their wickedness to kill Jesus, but they were also thinking about getting rid of Lazarus, against whom they could not direct even the appearance of an accusation. They had banned the blind man from the synagogue because he had spoken bravely in defence of Jesus' glory before them; now their jealousy had grown to such a point of wickedness that they wanted to kill Lazarus, a well-born and influential man by whom they had never been challenged in word or deed and against whom they could not even invent anything. Their only reason was that many Jews, stirred by so plain a miracle, were defecting from the Pharisees' conspiracy and believing in Jesus.[15]

But on the next day, when the great crowd of people that had gathered in Jerusalem for the festival learned that Jesus had left Bethany and was on his way to Jerusalem, to honour him they went out to meet him, having cut branches of palms from the trees to strew his path as he entered the city. For this tree was the crown and triumphal emblem of conquerors, evergreen, tall and hard to climb, but with a very sweet fruit, by the innate force of its nature rising against a burden put on it.[16] Further, in the way that people generally give evidence of public joy, they shouted what it says in the Psalms: 'Hosanna, praise and honour to him whom we have long awaited, who comes in the name of the Lord.'[17] Jesus too, until now always lowly and a scorner of all worldly glory, at this time chose to come to Jerusalem in a new kind of procession. For though earlier he habitually travelled on foot, he got a donkey and rode it, partly to teach his disciples how empty is the glory of this world and partly to carry out Isaiah's prophecy about him.[18] For it is written, 'Do not fear, daughter of Zion; behold, your king comes to you, gentle, riding on the foal of a donkey.'[19] Surely such a procession befits the king of the spiritual Jerusalem, which is the church. The apostles certainly did not understand these things at the time, believing that this was happening by chance. But after Jesus was glorified in his death, resurrection, and the sending of the Holy Spirit, then when they compared the words of the prophet with the event, they realized that what the crowd had shouted and what he himself had done by arriving in this way had been written about him. For there were many who were waiting for the sort of king that this world has.[20] Christ wanted their expectation to be thwarted, showing that the gospel kingdom consists in gentleness and heavenly teaching, not in the resources of this world.

This very notable enthusiasm of the people had been stirred up by many who had earlier been at Bethany when our Lord Jesus woke Lazarus from the tomb, and what they had seen with their own eyes they had told to others. And hence the great throng of people had come out to meet Jesus, because they had learned from those who saw it that he had performed this remarkable miracle, such as had never been heard of since the creation of the world.[21] Because the miracle clearly displayed a divine power, honour too was shown him such as had been shown to none of the prophets. This fact drove the hearts of the priests and Pharisees almost to despair. Nonetheless they did not repent of their wicked undertaking, but muttered among themselves, saying, 'You see that with all our schemes we make no headway[22] against him, but the more we oppose him, the brighter his authority shines and the more the enthusiasm of the people is kindled. Once he had a few disciples; now look, the whole world[23] has defected from us to him, so that now it is not safe for us to lay hands on him publicly.' The sinful Pharisees were saying this to urge each other on to attack our Lord Jesus with greater resources and deceits; hence they did not carry out this crime earlier, but only when the Pharisees, scribes, priests, and elders were in overwhelming agreement, when the people also, fickle of heart as they are, were kindled by the same madness, and with the further addition of the authority of Pilate the governor, and not without deceit being added, through Judas his betrayer.

But at that time so great was the people's good will towards Jesus that gentiles too, who had come to Jerusalem to worship there out of reverence, were gripped by longing to see Jesus. For the respect for the temple was so great that many came there even from distant parts out of reverence. What is more, a kind of image of the future was being displayed even then, because the gentiles, once idol worshippers, would converge on the church, of which the Jerusalem temple was the model, and they would embrace Jesus, rejected by the Pharisees, with the reverence he is owed. Now these men had a great desire to see Jesus, of whom they had heard such wonderful things, but diffidence prevented them from approaching him, for they wished not only to see him in passing among the crowd but to greet him personally and hear him speak. So they approached Philip, to whom they were known because of the proximity of his birthplace (for he was born in Bethsaida, which is in Galilee of the gentiles), to arrange access to Jesus for them. For they indicated that they were gripped with a great desire to see him. Philip shared the matter with Andrew, his comrade from the same town, for Andrew stood higher[24] with the Lord because he had been the very first one called. So the two of them went to Jesus and explained to him that there were some men, not Jews but gentiles, who burned with longing to see him, if he saw fit to grant them admittance.

But when Jesus learned from the disciples that even gentiles were gripped by longing to see him though he was so wickedly scorned by the Pharisees and priests, he took the opportunity to begin to reveal to his disciples his own death and what gain it would bring not only to the Jewish race but to the whole world; for just as the miracle of raising one man, Lazarus, from the dead had drawn not only many Jews but also gentiles to love him, likewise his death and resurrection would draw all the nations of the entire world. So when his disciples explained the gentiles' pious feeling, Jesus replied to them, 'You have heard the Jews shouting, "Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord." You see the gentiles rushing up with a similar desire.[25] The reason is that the time is now at hand when, while the Pharisees will think that the Son of man has been utterly done away with, he will be especially glorified among all the nations of the world. It is a new kind of glory, and it must be obtained in a new way. In this life I have drawn only a few people; when I am dead, my fame will spread more widely and will draw more to me than my bodily presence drew.[26] You shrink from the mention of my death; but be very sure that unless a kernel of wheat is cast forth onto the earth and is buried and decays and dies there, no growth comes from it, but solitary and alone it stays intact. But if it dies and is buried in the earth, it comes up again with great increase, giving a hundredfold for each kernel, and soon the abundant crop fills the fields far and wide, and enriches the countryside with its bountiful yield. What is useful for more people must be more sought for; and the salvation of many must be purchased by the death of a few. To expend life in this way is not death but gain,[27] and it is not the loss of one's life but the saving of it. For the soul, though it leaves the body, does not perish, and the body itself does not entirely perish, since some day it will live again, immortal and more blessed. Hence whoever loves life here in this world[28] is losing it while he saves it to no good effect. On the other hand, whoever hates his life in this world and, for the sake of the increase of the gospel, subjects it to dangers and death, does not lose the life he is expending but saves it, and in return for a mortal, short, and unhappy life[29] will get everlasting blissful life in the resurrection. Likewise he who saves a kernel of wheat loses what was going to die in any case; but he who digs it into the ground has actually saved it quite well, and in a little while will get back with interest what he seemed to have lost.

'So there is no reason why my death should trouble you, a death which you will even have to imitate some day,[30] in order to be sharers in my glory and immortality as you will have been imitators of my death. Like a proprietor of the gospel business, I will willingly pay with my life for the salvation of the world and for my Father's glory. You will be agents of the same business, by your preaching spreading what I have done and taught throughout the whole world. What the priests and Pharisees are now devising against me will be plotted against you by sinful people who love this world more than God, who while they foolishly save their life here are losing eternal life and are hurling themselves headlong into eternal death. If anyone declares himself my disciple, my servant, he must follow me as his master and Lord. For it is right that a servant not be torn away from his lord, either in joys or sorrows. Those whom I will have as sharers and companions in suffering I will not separate from sharing in my bliss, but wherever I am, my servant will be there also. Though I am rejected by the world, nonetheless the Father will raise me to glory. But if anyone shows himself my faithful servant, in return for the temporary ills and the disgrace with which he was afflicted among mankind, my Father will adorn him with eternal bliss and true glory. For my Father will not only acknowledge me; he will also acknowledge the servants of his only Son, and will honour with a like reward those who he knows have undergone like sufferings. Certainly this present affliction has its agony of pain, because of the weakness of the human body, but the fearfulness of human nature is to be overcome by contemplation of the salvation of many and of the bliss of everlasting life, things which are purchased at the cost of a brief agony. But if at some point you sense your nature shrinking from the threatening terrors of punishment and death, do not immediately break and recoil from the gospel business, but let the weakness of your human nature be overcome by your strength of spirit, depending always on the protection of your heavenly Father.

'In fact, I feel my own soul troubled at the approaching day of death. I see that a very severe storm threatens.[31] What am I to say, or where shall I turn? Shall I heed the weakness of my body, which shudders at death? Shall I flee to the protection of the world? Shall I disregard the life of the world out of love for my own life?[32] By no means. I shall fit myself to the Father's will. The weakness of my nature,[33] troubled by the dread of death, will say to him, "Father, if it can be done, save me from this pressing danger of death." But soon the love that is eager for human salvation will add, "No, if this is the best way, let the desired death come, since willingly and knowingly, in accordance with the will of my spirit, which in no point differs from yours, I have offered myself to death. Carry out your promise that my death and my resurrection will make your name glorious among all the nations of the world, so that once you are known they may glorify you and obtain everlasting salvation."'

When Jesus, with his eyes lifted to heaven, had made this prayer, the voice of the Father came from heaven, saying, 'I have made my name glorious, and I shall glorify it further hereafter.' For by now he had become glorious among mortals through his Son in many miracles, but especially in the raising of Lazarus, and soon he was going to increase the glory of his name among all the nations of the world, through the cross, the resurrection, the ascension into heaven, the sending of the Holy Spirit, and the preaching of the apostles.[34]

Now when the crowd that was standing not far away heard the voice from heaven, they had not been paying much attention, and there was no agreement about the source of the voice; so there was a variety of opinions. Some took it that what they had heard was thunder, for the voice had come from the clouds. Others again understood it more sympathetically, saying, 'An angel has spoken to him.' But to make them more attentive and dispel the suspicion of glory-seeking from himself, Jesus said, 'This was not the voice of thunder or of an angel, but of my Father, who has heard my prayers. It did not come on my account, for I know that the spirit of the Father is in me, but on your account, so that you may understand that my Father and I are in agreement, and that whatever I do, I do on his authority for the sake of your salvation. You have heard what my Father promised about my death. The last struggle with Satan is now at hand, Satan the prince or rather tyrant[35] of this world, who until now has by sin held in death all those who love this world. Now the world's case is brought up for trial.[36] But when his deceit has been exposed the truth will shine out, and the prince of the world, the author of death, even while he thinks himself victorious, will through death be deposed from his tyranny. For the sin of all will be pardoned through faith in the gospel.[37] With sin removed, the might of the tyrant is shattered, and he has no other weapon; and as he who will seem to have conquered will be driven in an instant from his kingdom, so I, who shall seem to be done away with, shall be lifted from the earth and draw all things everywhere to me, claiming for myself by right what he till now has held by tyranny.'

Now Christ's remark, 'When I am lifted[38] from the earth,' was an ambiguous expression, yet was quite well suited to describing the fact. It meant the kind of death he would meet, for those who are nailed to a cross hang high so that they are visible to everyone from far off. At the same time it recalled the old story that tells about the bronze serpent, the model of Christ, that was hung on a tall pole and offered ready help against the poisonous bites of serpents to everyone who turned his eyes towards it, no matter how far away.[39] And yet there were some in the crowd who, since death had been mentioned just before, deduced that he had spoken of the punishment of the cross.[40] And from that they were quick to conclude that he was not the messiah, since he prophesied that he would die, while Scripture attributes eternal power and kingdom to the messiah. For so Daniel writes: 'His power is eternal power that shall not be taken away, and his kingdom is one that shall not be destroyed' [7:14]. Again the prophet Micah speaks thus: 'And his goings forth are from the beginning, from the days of eternity' [5:2]. Also Isaiah: 'And his peace shall have no end' [9:7].[41] In fact the prophecy of the Psalms also promises him eternal priesthood, saying, 'You are a priest forever, after the order of Melchizedek' [110:4]. So they said to him, 'We have learned from the law that when the messiah comes, he will have no end. Then what is the meaning of your statement that the Son of man will be lifted from the earth? Now if to be lifted from the earth is to die, and if every time you say "Son of man" you mean us to understand yourself, either you will not die or the Son of man is not the messiah, assuming that the prophecy speaks the truth.'[42]

Since this was said with malicious intent, Jesus made no reply. For he could have answered that he was not only a human being but also God, and that in his human body he was indeed going to die but would soon rise again, and that this death was no obstacle to the endlessness of his kingdom, which was not worldly but spiritual. But the people were not capable of understanding such mysteries, and it was not the right time to bring them out. He merely urged them to let go of their blindness of heart and stop clamouring against the light of truth, especially since it would soon be taken from them. Not that the gospel light would ever be extinguished, but because hereafter they would not hear its teaching from his mouth, or see him doing miracles that would show them light for repentance. He said, 'For a little while the light dwells among you.[43] So walk while you have the light available, making spiritual progress while you have the chance, lest when the light is suddenly removed night overtake you and then, once it is gone, you long in vain for what you now spurn when it is offered to you. Whoever follows the blind passions of his heart walks in darkness and does not know where he is going; and while he thinks he is acting rightly and devoutly, he stumbles into death. I am the light of the world; whoever believes in me will not stray from the truth.[44] The children of the darkness flee from light. So as long as you have the light among you, believe in it, so that you may clearly be children of the light. Whoever believes, sees; whoever does not believe, though he has sight, is blind.'[45] Jesus said no more to them at that time, so as not to aggravate their rage further, which he knew was quite ready for any kind of wrongdoing; he went away and concealed himself from them, as if to soothe their unbridled madness by his absence and silence.[46] At the same time he was also incidentally reminding us that whenever we must deal with stubborn people and there is no hope of making headway, we should yield for the time being, to avoid not only making our own efforts futile but also making others more hardened in their sins.

For what was more hopeless than the hearts of those Jews? Though our Lord Jesus should have won their firmest faith in his words by so many miracles, so manifest and remarkable, done before their very eyes, they still stood fast in their unbelief, blinded, to be sure, by jealousy, hatred, self-seeking, greed, and the other base lusts of the heart. And Isaiah, inspired by the spirit of God, had already long ago foretold that there would be people of this type, saying, 'Lord, who has believed in our words, and to whom has the arm of the Lord been revealed?' Surely they did not perceive the divine power in Jesus' acts for the reason that, blinded by their own wickedness, they did not believe. And they could not believe, because they were unwilling to cast off their base desires.[47] Isaiah had foretold this too: 'He has blinded their eyes and hardened their hearts, lest they see with their eyes and understand in their hearts, and turn, and I save them.' 'For seeing they did not see, and understanding they did not understand' [Isa 6:9], and in opposition to their own salvation they plotted all kinds of things against him from whom alone salvation was to be hoped for. Isaiah had foretold these things long ago when, inspired by the mystic spirit, he saw with his prophetic eyes the glory of the Son of God which would someday live in a human body, and what he saw he prophesied, and what he prophesied would happen, we believe has come to pass.

But the unbelief of these people did not shut out the salvation of others who did believe. For many had believed in Jesus, not just from among the common people, but also from among the leading men; yet the leading men did not dare proclaim him openly, out of fear of the Pharisees, who had published an edict that whoever proclaimed himself a disciple of Jesus would be banned from the synagogue. (And after all, those who hold high rank in the world do not endure disgrace.) For these leaders' faith was not yet solid and complete; but even then it was some beginning of a gospel attitude for them to think well of Jesus though fear and shame prevented them from displaying it. Some were prevented by jealousy, some by greed, some by self-seeking, from wholeheartedly clinging fast to Christ, for whose sake everything is to be despised. So since the Holy Spirit had not yet been granted to perfect their strength in the gospel, many were hesitant believers, still loving human glory more than the glory of God. To have the more honourable seating in the synagogue was a grand thing with mortals, but to be banned from the synagogue of the sinful on Christ's account would have been glory with God.[48] But in mortals, naturally weak as they are, hesitation and feebleness easily find pardon. On the other hand, in the case of those who had been so blinded by base lusts that in full awareness of wrongdoing they protested against Christ, turned the people from him, laid traps for him, and even schemed his death, it was necessary that they perish, because they did not want to be saved.

Again at another time Jesus came forward where the Jews could see him, at a time when their rage ought to have abated, so that he could urge everyone to believe, and not leave any excuse for those who were perishing from their own wickedness. Showing how great was the gain for those who believed and how great the destruction for those persisting in their unbelief, he cried out and said, 'You all proclaim that you believe in God. Yet because I have come from God and neither do nor say anything without his warrant, anyone who believes in me does not believe in me – for I do nothing on my own account – but believes in him who sent me into the world. The world is full of the darkness of sin and error.[49] And therefore as the beam comes down from the sun,[50] I have come down into the world from the Father, who is the source of all light, to dispel error, remove sin, and be the light of the world. And it is by faith that the eyes of the blind are opened so that they may see the light and no longer stumble in the dark. So all my teaching, my miracles, whatever I have done or am yet to do is to this end: that whoever believes in me and puts all his trust in me should not remain in darkness but that, enlightened by knowledge of the truth, cleansed from all the sins of his former life, with the guidance of the light, through devotion to the gospel, he may go forward into everlasting life.

'But if someone hears my words and does not heed them, far from benefiting from hearing them, he will have an even worse end because of his unbelief – not that I will condemn him. For I have not come at this time to condemn the world for its crimes, but to save the world cleansed through faith. But if anyone, on hearing my words, rejects and scorns them, he will not escape the dreadful judgment. Now, to be sure, I am leaving nothing undone to draw everyone to eternal salvation, nor will anyone perish by my fault. But whoever spurns the salvation offered him, this very word that I am now saying will condemn him, and on the last day it will show proof that he perishes by his own wickedness. I have invited you with rewards, I have warned you of punishment, I have enticed you with good deeds, I have roused you with miracles; I refuse no one salvation, I open an easy entry to life for anyone at all. On the last day, then, what excuse will be offered by the one who, though he was summoned to belief in so many ways, persisted in his blindness?

'If you are worshippers of God as you think you are, if you revere the law, you cannot spurn my words. For I have not spoken on my own authority like those who invent what stories they please for their own glory or profit; and I do not teach things contrary to the law. But what the law foreshadowed in images and promised in prophecies, I fulfil. After all, the Father, who is the source of the law and from whom I came here, laid down for me what I should say and how I should say it. So since I follow his commandments in all respects, how can you honour him when you are spurning his delegate? What is more, what he commanded me he commanded for no other reason than out of love for you, so that, believing in what he says to you through me, you may obtain eternal life. As the Father thirsts for the salvation of all and seeks the destruction of none, so I too thirst for the salvation of all, and I will not allow anyone to perish, so far as I am able. Also, since I am certain that everything he has wanted me to say concerns your salvation, for that reason I am not silent about any of the things which he laid down for me to say. This is the intention of God the Father for you, and this is my intention, which agrees in all things with the Father's intention; see that you do not fall short of it, voluntarily calling down ruin on yourselves when you could obtain everlasting salvation.'

Chapter 13

With words of this kind our Lord Jesus urged the sinful crowd to take thought for their own salvation and cease from their wicked undertaking, since he had otherwise left nothing untried by which they could be recalled to a better frame of mind. Now it remained for him to equip his own disciples, whom he had particularly chosen, whom he would soon leave, and who he knew would be greatly disheartened at the death of their teacher, against the storm that was brewing, and to pluck from the depths of their hearts the banes of gospel purity – jealousy, hatred, scorn, self-seeking – and to implant feelings opposite to these. In doing so he displayed the evidences of the unbounded love on whose example they were to model themselves in mutual affection for one another, and he demonstrated the nature of a then unheard-of gentleness and humility, so that they would outstrip each other in turn in performing services for one another. It was the day before Pascha, which, as mentioned, is Phase in Hebrew, that is, Passover, and our Lord Jesus, whom nothing ever escaped, knew that the time was now at hand when he too, answering to the name of the festival, would pass over from this world and return to his Father, from whom he had come.[1] So while he had always loved his apostles, whom he had particularly chosen as his intimates and friends, who were not going to leave the world yet but would have a long and mighty struggle with the world,[2] he made his unending love[3] for them plain. The impending storm of his death did not drive out the affection he had for them; instead, at the very point of departure he displayed the signs of a rare love – not that he had loved them less earlier, but he wanted the impression that he made on their hearts in his departing to be quite firmly fixed.

So he had decided that after the preparations[4] for that last mystical meal, in which, by giving the sacred symbol of his body and blood, he was going to establish the perpetual memory of himself,[5] he would also ratify the bond of a friendship that would never in any way perish. And yet he was well aware that at the devil's prompting Judas Iscariot was already working to betray him to arrest by the Jews; the plague of greed had so taken over Judas' mind that he could not be recalled from his criminal wickedness even by his teacher's great mildness and kindliness towards him. And though Jesus knew that the Father would not let perish anything of what he had given to Jesus to save, and though he was aware that he would soon go to the Father from whom he had come, nonetheless he wanted to remove from his disciples' hearts all deep-seated inclination to self-seeking. So when the meal was already laid out, he rose, took off his clothes so that he would clearly look like a servant,[6] and picked up a linen cloth and tied it around himself. Then he himself filled a basin with water, and setting about what the world considered the most demeaning performance of service, he began to wash his disciples' feet. This sort of service was indeed ordinarily offered to guests and friends according to Hebrew custom,[7] but what Christ did was not only a model of boundless humility but also an image of mystical meaning: that is, that those who gird themselves for the task of preaching the gospel,[8] who want to be sharers in the Lord's table, ought to be quite pure from all earthly desires, but that such purity comes to no one except when our Lord Jesus in his goodness washes away all filth of our weakness, for he alone was free from every spot of sin and he lived as a human among humans without acquiring any human stain from the traffic of life.

So when in this fashion the Lord of all in heaven and earth, who knew all that was to be, who had all things given him by the Father, yet girded in servants' fashion, unclothed, carrying a basin, came to Simon Peter and bent down before him to wash his feet, Peter shrank back from the unheard-of example of humility.[9] Thus he acknowledged his own weakness, thus he contemplated the worthiness of the Lord, which he had at any rate observed from his miracles and his wonderful teaching, even if he had not yet learned fully the divine nature in Jesus. He had not yet seen him rise from the dead or ascend into heaven or sit at the right hand of the heavenly Father,[10] or be worshipped with divine honours by the whole world, but these things, learned later, further commended the example of such remarkable humility. So Peter, in the same spirit in which the Baptist had declined to bestow baptism on Jesus,[11] refused to be washed by his teacher and said, 'Lord, what is this that you mean to do? Are you washing my feet? I know what I am, and I know what you are.' To Peter's refusal Jesus quickly replied, 'Peter, allow me to do what I am doing. My action is neither frivolous nor useless. It is true that you do not yet understand what it means, but you will understand later, and then you will learn that what I am now doing was necessary for you.'

Not restrained even by this answer, since he did not understand it, Peter refused all the more, saying, 'I shall never allow you, great as you are, to wash the feet of such a one as me.' But in order to drive this passionate refusal away, though it came from love, the Lord stopped him with threats, like driving out one nail with another,[12] since Peter could not yet be taught, and said, 'Why do you struggle against me, Peter? If I do not wash you, you cannot be a partner with me. Either you will be washed or you will be removed from partnership in my table and my bond. The one I admit to my fellowship must be clean.' Now Jesus said this not about washing the body's feet but about the imitation of such remarkable humility, about purity of mind, which must be greatest in those who proclaim the gospel teaching and take up the care of the church's flock.

But Peter was in the grip of fervent love for the Lord, and although he did not then understand what Jesus' words meant, still when he heard that he would be excluded from the fellowship of the one he loved above all – for the mention of separation is harsh to a lover[13] – he suddenly became even more passionate in permitting than he had just been in refusing.[14] 'Lord,' he said, 'rather than be torn away from you, I allow you to wash not only my feet, since you wish it, but my hands and head also.' In reply the Lord said, 'Whoever has been washed once has no need to be washed again. For once he is clean in the rest of his body, nothing is left but for him to wash his feet, which collect dirt from continually[15] touching the ground.' In this puzzling statement, of course, our Lord Jesus indicated that the general purity that baptism and declaration of the gospel faith provides for everyone is not sufficient for the preacher of the gospel,[16] unless his feet, that is, the desires of his heart,[17] are continually cleansed from all this world's defilements, from which scarcely any human being can be cleansed unless he continually seeks through Christ's mercy to wash off the contamination acquired from the traffic with humanity. 'So I do not wash the rest of your bodies again,' he said; 'I only wash your feet. For you disciples are clean, though not all of you are.' In making this exception our Lord Jesus reproached Judas Iscariot's guilty conscience, for he knew who would betray him to the Jews. So great was Jesus' gentleness that though he knew, he did not betray Judas to the others or exclude him from the foot-washing or banish him from the sacred feast or the sharing in his body and blood; he only touched the conscience of

Judas, who was known to him, so that he might even then repent once he understood that he did not escape the notice of the Lord he had determined to betray.[18] Thus it was on Judas' account that Jesus had said, 'You disciples are indeed clean, but not all of you are.'

So having completed this service for his twelve apostles, Jesus put his clothes on again and joined his followers at the table to take the meal. But first he again implanted in their hearts the example of humility he had shown them, so that what was chiefly necessary could not through their forgetfulness escape them. For he said, 'Do you understand what it means for me to have washed the feet of you all? You call me teacher and Lord, and rightly so, for I truly am what you call me. But if I, who am truly your teacher and Lord, have washed your feet, much more will you, who are each other's brothers and fellow servants, not be offended to perform services for each other in turn. For I, so much your superior, have shown you this example so that it would not disgust you to imitate with your equals what I have displayed towards disciples and servants, and so that it would shame one brother and fellow servant to assume tyrannical arrogance over another, when I, who could rightly claim this height of honour for myself, have lowered myself to the point of washing your feet. And there is no reason why anyone should say, "What I am doing is demeaning, base, slavish." The greater each one is, the more he ought to humble himself.[19] Self-seeking is a plague that steals up even on gospel virtues. When you perform miracles in my name, when you cast out demons, when you restore the dead to life, when you prophesy, then especially you must remember what I have done for you today. Not by arrogance, not by scorn, not by violence will you have to defend the authority of the gospel; that authority will find its defence in other methods. This assuredly cannot be denied, as is quite well known to general human understanding too: the servant is not greater than his master, and one who is appointed to carry out someone else's business is not greater than he by whom he was appointed.[20] You acknowledge me as your master, and you will acknowledge me more later. You are my apostles, I am the one who appointed you. So it would be disgraceful for you to swell with scorn, and to act violently towards the flock to be entrusted to you or even among yourselves, when you have had experience of me, so mild and humble a Lord and teacher.

'Since you understand this now, if you carry it out later on you will be blessed, according to my teaching which I have often repeated and impressed on you so that it cannot somehow slip away. But this blessedness will not be for all of you. I have indeed chosen you all for the honour of the name of apostle, but not everyone will meet the qualification for this task. Those who carry out the office of apostle by modelling themselves on me will be blessed. But there is one among you who, far from emulating my example towards his brothers and fellow servants, with whom he has up till now been equal, is going to rear his head[21] even against me, being the kind of Lord and teacher I am. But the prophecy of the Psalm had already foretold that this would happen: "He who eats my bread will lift his heel against me."[22] I am telling you now what will happen before it takes place so that when you see accomplished what Scripture foretold, you will believe that I am the one about whom it prophesied and that nothing is being done against me by chance, but that this whole business is controlled by the divine purpose. What is more, just as anyone who imitates my example will be blessed, so anyone who prefers to model himself on the betrayer, whoever he is, will be wretched. For some day the betrayer is going to have many imitators of his wickedness, to whom money will be dearer than the glory of my name and who under cover of the office of apostleship will be betrayers of the apostolic task. Then the greater the glory of this task, the more serious the crime of misusing for treachery the office of proclaiming the gospel.[23] For indeed I assure you of this: whoever accepts the one I send accepts me; and whoever accepts me accepts the one who sent me. For as I, the apostle of the Father, do nothing except in accordance with the Father's will, likewise, if you who are my apostles faithfully carry out what is commanded you, you will be accepted by all devout people as if I am speaking through you, as the Father speaks through me, who teach nothing other than what he laid down.'

When Jesus had said this, comforting the hearts of his followers, soon, to dissuade them further from the example of his betrayer and to urge repentance more strongly on the betrayer, he grew troubled in his spirit, as if shrinking back from the destruction of one who was aiming at calling down eternal death on himself by his own wickedness.[24] And what he had said earlier he again emphatically affirmed would surely happen. He said, 'Again and again I say to you that one of you few who are here with me at the same table is going to betray me.' This statement, so often repeated, roused the hearts of his disciples, who had in any case already been seized by great grief because of the foretelling of the Lord's departure. As for most of them, each one was comforted by the knowledge of his own innocence, because only one had been marked as the future traitor, but Jesus' adding 'one of you' was disturbing, and they had no doubt that what the Lord foretold would happen at some time; yet no one, weighing all the others by the standard of his own heart, could suspect another of so great a crime except in so far as the weakness of each one's human nature was already suspect.[25] Judas alone, in full knowledge of his own guilt, neither shrank back nor felt shame, and did not scruple to be present at the sacred banquet, and could now bear the gaze of his Lord, to whom he knew his plans were no secret. So great was the plague of greed, and to such an extent did it please him to misuse the now well-known mildness of the Lord.

And so the rest of the disciples, grieving and anxious, looked at each other to see if they could get from an expression any hint of who had been marked by these words of Jesus; doubtless they were on the point of assaulting the one who had conceived in his heart such a wicked crime. Certainly Simon Peter's heart was on fire,[26] for no one loved the Lord more ardently, but the boldness which his love for his teacher usually prompted had before now often turned out not at all well. Earlier he had heard, 'Get behind me, Satan; you are not wise in the ways of God.' Just now he had heard, 'You will not have a share with me.' And so although he passionately desired to be freed from this anxiety and to identify for certain the deviser of such a wicked deed, intending not to let him be part of the banquet at all, he himself still did not dare to ask Jesus who was the traitor that he was singling out.[27] But there was a particular disciple whom the Lord loved more intimately and who was at that moment reclining on the Lord's breast, in tender intimacy being comforted and restored from his grief and despair at the Lord's imminent death.[28] Peter signalled to him with a nod that he should ask who it was about whom Jesus had spoken. So the disciple, as he rested there on Jesus' breast, said to him in a whisper, 'Lord, who is the man who will dare such a deed?' Jesus answered him privately,[29] 'It is the one to whom I will offer a moistened morsel.' And when he had moistened bread in the broth,[30] he gave a morsel of it to Judas, son of Simon, the Iscariot. And even so the wretched traitor did not blush or repent, but barefaced, scorning the Lord's knowledge of his crime and disdaining such great mildness, he took from the Lord's hand the sign of the friendship that for a paltry fee he would soon betray.

And after he took the mouthful, Satan seized control of his whole heart and turned him from a sinful man into an unsalvageable one.[31] Now when Jesus saw that Judas' wickedness was determined and that it was not averted by either shame or fear (for Judas had almost been betrayed just then, and he would have been in real danger if Jesus had betrayed him), he sent him away from the banquet and gave him the opportunity to carry out the deed he had already carried out in making it his fixed purpose. He said, 'Do what you are doing quickly.' Only Judas, who knew his own intention, understood that remark; none of the others at the meal realized why Jesus had said it. For, since uprightness is not at all suspicious, the suspicion could not enter anyone's heart that he to whom Jesus had offered so many proofs of his love, and seemed in some fashion to prefer to the others (since the common cash-box had been entrusted to him), who at that dinner was placed fairly close to Jesus, to whom Jesus had just offered a moistened mouthful – that such a man would dare such a monstrous deed as to betray him to his death. What is more, some, since they knew that the cash-box was entrusted to Judas, understood Jesus' remark, 'Do what you are doing quickly,' to mean that the Lord had advised him to buy something of the necessities for the festival, or to give something to the needy. For Jesus was in the habit of often giving him that task, instructing and inciting us, by the way, to kindness towards the poor.[32]

But Judas, having taken the mouthful and showing no sign that he understood the Lord's remark, immediately left the room. For it was not proper that one who had surrendered himself entirely to Satan, and time and again had shown himself to Jesus as incurable, should any longer be in the fellowship of the saints. What is more, it was night, the time providing proof that his mind was blinded by the blackness of greed, since he removed himself from the light, and he was so hastening towards the work of the prince of darkness that, untroubled by the lateness of the hour, he did not delay the deed he had fixed on.[33] He had not been without his evil will earlier, but the opportunity had not then been granted him by Jesus, so that even at this point it would be clear that no one could have prevailed in any way against Jesus unless he himself made an opportunity for the sinful will to carry out in fact what it had fixed on in intent.

So once he who had made himself unworthy of this company was gone, Jesus began to say many things to his disciples, partly to comfort and strengthen them, and partly to equip them against the threatening storm, planting deep in their hearts what they could not fully comprehend at that time, untrained as they were and weighed down with grief and weariness, but what nonetheless they would understand later on.[34] And first he indicated that his death was imminent, a death which, though it seemed by the world's standard to be full of shame, would still shed light on the glory of the Father and also on his own. 'Now the very thing,' he said, 'that you have heard me praying to avoid is being carried out.[35] For now the time is near for the Son of man, who until now has seemed lowly and despised, to be made illustrious among mankind in a new way, and through him the Father's glory will be made to shine too. For as he has never sought his own glory but has through his weakness shed light on the Father's glory, so in turn the Father, who is the source of all true glory, will glorify his Son among mortals; he will make it known to the world not through angels or archangels or any other created being[36] but through his very self that the glory of the Father and the Son is one, so that this glory becomes known among humans by the shared effort of the two in turn, not so that anything might be added to them but so that humankind, upon learning the glory of each, may attain true glory. Further, some day he will make his Son at his last coming entirely glorious in full view of all the inhabitants of heaven and earth; but now at this time too he will glorify him by his very death, which will be mightier than all mortal power, and soon by his resurrection and ascension.[37]

'Therefore, my dear children, do not let my death dishearten you, which, though it seems to be a mark of weakness, will be mightier than my life; though it will seem to be full of shame, it will shed light on my glory and on the Father's glory; though it will seem to be my destruction, it will bring salvation both to you and to the whole world. Let these things comfort your heart's grief. For it is best for you that this mortal body be taken from your sight, and now the time is near for it to happen. Delight in me now as in one who is soon to depart, and impress on your hearts what I command you. Otherwise, as I said to the Jews, you will seek for me in vain when I am gone; for I am going soon, and I am going where at present you cannot follow. So it remains for you to bear my departure bravely and to keep my teaching and the memory of me impressed on your souls. That is what will make you happy, rather than the sight of this mortal body.[38]

'The commandments of the law of Moses are many; now that I am going I enjoin one new commandment on you, that you love one another just as I have loved you. I have not wielded tyranny over you, I have not pursued glory, I have not reaped profit or any human good from you. I have loved your salvation, and loved it freely, and I have loved it to the point of death.[39] Since I shall willingly pay with my life for you, then love one another in the same way. The disciples of others are distinguished by titles, dress, and set observances of rules. You have learned nothing of such things from me.[40] There is one mark by which people will know you are my true disciples, if you have such mutual love for one another as I have shown for all of you. This is a rare thing among mortals, but it is the fruit by which the good tree is recognized.'[41]

Even though Peter, who was completely ablaze[42] with love for the Lord, was upset at the prospect of his death, still, since he had once heard 'Get behind me, Satan,' he did not dare to interrupt on the same subject again. But what tormented his loving heart was that his ability to follow when Jesus was torn from his friends was denied. For it is a great comfort, if you really love someone, to follow him into every circumstance, wheresoever in the world he may go.[43] So Peter asked, 'Lord, where are you going that it is forbidden to follow you?' Jesus replied, 'At present you will not be able to follow me where I am going; but later you will follow.' While Jesus meant his own death, which they were not yet fit to undergo, Peter still did not understand what these words meant, and said, 'Lord, why can't I follow you? What danger would I refuse to endure on your behalf, for I am even ready to pay with my life for you?' Surely a sincere love made this statement, braver than its strength, but still a human love, and one not yet sufficiently known to itself.[44]

Jesus wanted to shape his successor gradually and to pluck from out of the depths of his followers' hearts reliance on human strength. Just as he had removed and rejected such reliance earlier when Peter had over-confidently discouraged him from undergoing death, and again just as Peter was snatched up when he had rushed into the water and then doubted, and as he just now was stopped when he would not obey Jesus as he was about to wash his feet,[45] so here Peter was taught not to rely on his own strength or trust his own feelings, but mistrusting himself to depend on Christ's resources. So Jesus said, 'Peter, what are you saying? What grand promises you make us about yourself! You will pay with your life for me? No; but the very event will teach you how true are the words I said a little while ago, which earned no credit with you, "Where I go you cannot now follow me." And the test is not far off, for be very certain that far from your being able to save my life with your own, before the cock crows this night, that is, by first cock-crow, you will deny me three times.' With these words the Lord put a stop to Peter's grand talk, though it came from his great love, and at the same time he warned the others not to trust their own strength in dangers but to understand that if they distinguished themselves in any such thing as this it was a mark of divine power and gift. At this Peter fell silent, still not completely free from anxiety about the treachery Jesus had mentioned.

Chapter 14

These words indicated that a new and dreadful storm was threatening, that would drive even Peter, the bravest of them all, to lose his way so far as to deny the Lord three times in the same night. But since the disciples were very much dispirited and, following Peter's lead, each one feared for himself, their most merciful teacher comforted his troubled and grieving disciples with gentler talk. 'Everything that I have foretold,' he said, 'will surely take place, but there is no need for you to lose heart or be troubled on that account. What will happen to me, and what will be done to you afterwards, is dreadful, and the weakness of human nature does not escape me, but if you put all your faith in God and in me, there is no reason to fear any assaults of sinful people. For God is almighty, and he alone can do more than all those who attack you.[1] You certainly have faith in him, even according to Moses' teaching. But if you really have faith in him, you ought to have faith in me also.[2] Through him I shall triumph, and you will triumph through me, if you will mistrust your own resources and place all your trust and hope in me. Not even death itself will be able to separate us. Just as you will some day be sharers in my sufferings, so you will also be sharers in my crown. I will be the first to display the ideal form and model of the struggle and the victory. Through me you will be given strength, through me you will be given your share in the glory. Only have faith in me.

'There are already in my Father's house many dwelling-places prepared for the victors. For the rewards are not prepared for me alone, and Peter is not the only one who will follow me, but rewards are prepared, for each his own, for all those who cling to me in love and the gospel faith.[3] But if I did not know for certain that dwelling-places have already been prepared for you, soon to welcome you when you have been removed from the tumults of this world into the bliss of eternal life, I would have told you before now that I was going ahead to the Father to prepare a place there for you also,[4] for I will not let you be separated from me. As it is, since I know definitely that a dwelling-place in the Father's kingdom has been prepared for each of you, there is no reason why you should be anxious about your reward; you need only see to it that you fight bravely. But even if I were going away especially to prepare a place for you,[5] there is still no reason why you should think yourselves abandoned. For I am going to come back to you, to welcome you wholly to myself, never to be separated from me again, so that wherever I may be, you will be there also. There is no reason for you not to be sure that you will come to the place where I am now going. Indeed, you too know where I am going, and you are not ignorant of the way.' For in this puzzling statement the Lord hinted that he was going to the Father, but by way of death on the cross. The destination was desirable, but the road seemed unlovely. The disciples could hardly be unaware of this, having heard it so many times from the Lord, but grief and forgetfulness made them not know what they did know.

And so Thomas, eager to learn for certain where exactly the Lord was going to go, said, 'Lord, since we do not know where you are going, how can we know the way? Actually we know neither, though you say we know both.' In these passionate but ignorant words Thomas tried to force, as it were, the Lord to say more clearly where exactly he was going, which all of them had been desperately longing to learn. But Jesus, schooling and moulding his followers little by little, did teach them what they wanted to know, but still in a rather covert way, so that what they had only just learned would cling more deeply.[6] The lesson was, of course, that he was leaving mortality behind and returning to the Father from whom he had come before he took his mortal body; and that there was entry to the Father for no one except through the Son, who alone opened the way into the heavens, who alone trained the faith of humankind in heavenly knowledge, alone was the source of immortality, and whoever clung fast to him would not have to fear death.

'How is it, Thomas,' he said, 'that you say you do not know the way? Unless perhaps you still do not know me completely. Indeed, I am the way, the truth, and the life. I have already said that I am returning to the Father; I alone open entry to him for everyone. And since the route to him is by deeds worthy of God, you and the others have your model in me; what is more, since no one comes to the Father without faith, from me you have learned the truth. But if fear of death is now troubling your hearts, know that immortality is assured you, since I am the life.[7] Only follow where I am going; believe and hold fast to what I have taught; hope confidently in what I promise. If you ask where I am going, I go to the Father; if you wish to know the way by which you can follow, no one comes to the Father except through me. So then you know both things, where I am going and where the road is, unless perhaps, that is, you do not know me. For if you knew me, you would know my Father too. In fact, in a way you already do know[8] the Father, who you think is unknown to you, and you know him not only from the law's instruction, but you have seen him.'

In this puzzling statement, of course, our Lord Jesus reminded them that the Father was indeed invisible, and he was not only invisible to the eyes of the body but he could not be perceived in his own nature by the soul; nonetheless in a certain way he had been seen in the Son, when they saw him in the Son commanding the winds and the sea, commanding the demons, dispelling with a word diseases no matter how incurable, summoning with a word the dead to life.[9] But the ignorance of the apostles did not yet follow these mysteries. And nonetheless just as if the Lord's remark were not true because they had not understood it, they were intent on seeing the Father, imagining that the Father could be looked at as they looked at the Son, their simple-mindedness was still so great – though those who had looked at the Son with the body's eyes had not seen him either. So Philip, more eager to learn than the others, said, 'Lord, you say that the Father has been seen by us; but if only you would grant us to be allowed to look on your Father, our prayers would be answered and we would want for nothing. We have indeed heard many things about him; the sight of him is all that is lacking.'

The Lord rebuked Philip's ignorant request, saying, 'Philip, have I been among you and the others for so long now and you still do not know[10] me? You know me not because you see my face but because you understand my power and truth. This is not seen by the body's eyes but perceived by the soul. So since I am the image of my Father, like him in every way, and since you ought to have known me by now from my deeds and words (indeed, to have seen them is to know me), with what brashness do you say to me "Show us the Father"? As if whoever sees me had not also seen my Father! Not that the Father is not a separate person from me, but in fact between the two of us there is no difference in our higher nature.[11] If you cannot follow what I say with your reason, whoever believes also sees.[12] You have heard me speaking, you have seen me performing miracles; in these things you have heard the Father, you have seen the Father. Or don't you yet believe what is the fact, that in an inseparable sharing of nature, will, and power, the Father is in me and I am in the Father? Whatever I say, I say in accordance with his intention; whatever I do, I do in accordance with his judgment. And so I am always in him because of the undivided partnership of our will and nature, and he is always in me, speaking through me, declaring his power through me by miracles. For I do not say anything myself that he does not also say through me, and I do not do anything myself that he does not at the same time accomplish through me. So how is it that you are separating the inseparable and once having seen the one are longing to see the other? Having known the one, do you believe that the other is unknown to you? Or do the rest of you also not yet believe that everything said or done by me is the Father's, and that there is no distinction between the two of us?[13] You ought to have believed me when I taught you these things so often, and if you had too little faith in my words, certainly the deeds that you saw, worthy of God and beyond a mere human, ought to have given you faith that anything that comes from me is the Father's. If the Father himself were speaking to you, he would say to you nothing other than what I am saying. If the Father were acting of himself, he would do no other than what I am doing. We have the same purpose, the same will, the same power and nature.

'So believe this, hold fast to this, keep this fixed in your hearts. If you do so, the removal of this body from your sight will bring you no loss. When I am gone you will see me better with the eyes of faith,[14] and what you now see being done through me by the Father, to whom I cling in every way, I in turn will do through you if you cling to me in faith and love. Indeed, I shall put forth the might of my godhead more clearly after I have withdrawn this weak form from your sight. Indeed, just as by nature I am never separated from the Father's fellowship, whoever joins himself to me by the gospel faith, through me will do greater things than I am doing whenever the glory of God calls for a miracle. For I myself will act through you as the Father now acts through me.[15] What is more, since it is best for the salvation of mankind that I return to the Father, you shall succeed to the gospel task. And not only will this happen, but whatever you ask besides from the Father in my name,[16] if it concerns the glory of the Father's name and mine, I will do, so that through you also I may be glorified among humankind as until now the Father has been glorified through me. So do not let my departure trouble you, for it will also bring you no little profit. Then especially will I be with you in all things that make for true salvation, when I have taken away this mere flesh from your sight. Only ask what you want; the Father will hear your prayers, and I, your constant advocate[17] before him, will cause whatever you ask for to be granted. For as he denies nothing to me, since I do nothing except what makes for his glory, so I will deny nothing to you when you do what leads to the glory of my name. For my Spirit will suggest to you what you ought to ask for.[18]

'To be pained at my departure is no proof of gospel love. For people are disheartened in that way at the passing of a friend whom they will soon forget.[19] If you truly love me as I love the Father, make your love for me known in actual fact; and you will make it known if you keep my commandments. Thus it will be that as the Father loves me and denies me nothing, so through me he will love you also as you do my bidding, which is the same as the Father's bidding. It is best for the salvation of the whole world that I take my presence from you, and yet when I go I will not leave you comfortless. Indeed, if you stand fast in love of me, if you keep my commandments, I will plead with the Father after I return to him, and he, who denies me nothing, will send another comforter[20] to you, one who once sent will never leave you as I now, in my physical presence, am torn from you, but he will stay steadfastly with you forever. He will be my Spirit and the Spirit of the Father; he will turn you from unspiritual into spiritual beings, and that human feeling in which you are now following me he will turn into heavenly love; by secret inspirations he will supply you with the truth of all the things which you now understand as if in a dream or mist. This will be a special pledge of myself to you. For at present I have shown myself to the evil and the good alike, so that no one could excuse himself by saying he was not invited to salvation. But since that Spirit is heavenly and truthful, this world, which craves earthly and deceitful goods, cannot receive him. Why not? Because, since it has dull vision that loves nothing except gross and earthly things, it does not see[21] him or know him. For he will slip silently into the secret feelings of the heart, wherever he finds a fitting seat. But if you spurn the delusions of this world and pursue the true good, you will know him, for he will not only come to you visibly[22] as I have come, but will also remain among you; and he will not be with you like a patron in the house of his dependent, but he will dwell in the innermost recesses of your souls, and will attach himself to your spirit so that one spirit may be formed in all.[23] Since he will be implanted in your hearts he will accompany you through everything. And the wait will not be long till this appointed comforter comes to you.

'So there is no reason for your heart to be saddened, dear children,[24] whom I have fathered, as it were, by my heavenly word and whom, unschooled as you are, I am cherishing until you grow to full strength in the gospel.[25] Although I am going away for now, and will no longer live as a mortal with mortals, still I will not meanwhile leave you orphans and bereft of the comfort of my presence. For before I return to my Father, I will come back to you and show myself to your sight in my true body, though no longer my mortal one, so that I may draw you bit by bit from love for the flesh to the spirit. For it would be nothing of any importance if I should offer you this body to be viewed unceasingly, which even the wicked see – to their own detriment. And so there is a brief time when the world will not see me. For death and the tomb will take me away from their sight; but I will visit you again, and show my resurrected self to you.[26] For this dying will not separate us, or hinder me from visiting you. For I will live even after death, and not only will I myself live, but I will also bestow everlasting life on you. And now, when I return, you and I will meet, the living with the living, and I will so pay with my life for you that you will be unharmed. Then you will understand more fully that as nothing can tear the Father away from me or me from the Father, likewise I will be so attached to you by our shared love, and you in turn to me, that not even death can separate us.[27]

'Only take care that you are not torn away through your own fault. Keeping my commandments will prove your true love. For one who neglects the bidding of his Lord does not love him from the heart. And it is not enough to receive my commandments unless one remembers them, nor is it sufficient to remember them unless they are kept.[28] Whoever fulfils them truly loves me. For to be pained at my departure is not a proof of true affection.[29] I truly love the Father and I do all his bidding, and will do it even to death on the cross. And there is no reason why my commandments should frighten you as being harsh, commandments about bearing injuries and taking up one's cross;[30] love will make all these sweet, and comfort from me will not be lacking. For whoever loves me will also be loved by my Father; and I will love him and never desert him, but I will return to visit him and will show myself to him openly to be gazed upon, so that it may be quite certain that I did not die in the punishment of the cross. Now I show myself to be seen by all; then no one will see me except whoever stands fast in friendship.' Now our Lord Jesus said all this rather inscrutably, hinting not only at the fact that once risen from death he was going to offer himself often to his friends' sight but also at the fact that through his Spirit he would wind his way into their hearts and at last would come in the glory of the Father, clearly visible to all.[31]

But Judas (not, of course, the Iscariot, who was not present at this conversation, but the other one, surnamed Lebbaeus)[32] did not completely understand the Lord's words, and, distressed by grief and dread, supposed that the Lord would appear to his friends in the way that ghosts and apparitions often present themselves in dark of night, or in the way that certain sights appear in dreams, with more the effect of fear than of comfort.[33] 'Lord,' he said, 'how is it that while now you are clearly visible to everyone, then you will not appear to the world but only to us? And how can you be visible to us if you are invisible to others?' But Jesus knew that his followers were not yet capable of that mystery, the mystery of how the same body which had died and been buried in the earth would rise again, but now made spiritual and independent. So he did not reply directly to the question but turned his words towards what had more to be implanted in their hearts so that they might be prepared for the spiritual availability of the Lord, since the way in which he would be available after the resurrection could not be long-lasting. He said, 'I will not show myself to the world because it does not love me or keep my commandments. If someone truly loves me, he will not give evidence of his love by grieving, but by keeping my commandments, and I will love him in turn. And whomever I love the Father will love also, and we will never be torn away from him. And not only will I return to visit the one who is mindful of my bidding, but the Father also and I will come to him by way of our common Spirit;[34] and we will not come only to depart soon thereafter, but we will make our dwelling in him and will never leave him. What happens in the Spirit is both permanent and powerful. Our physical association must have its end, in order for you to scorn the things that are temporary and come to love the things that are eternal. If you cannot yet come to us, then in an invisible but powerful manner we will come to you, to dwell in the temple of your heart. We are three, but so joined that whoever loves one necessarily loves all; whoever possesses one lacks none. Only let love be present, and let the bond which I have just made with you be kept. It will so attach you to us that neither life nor death can separate us.[35] Only if members can be torn from the head can we be divided.[36]

'There are many who profess to love God the Father, and appear to keep the commandments of the law; but no one truly loves God if he hates or scorns his Son. And whoever does not keep my commandments does scorn him. Further, whoever neglects my commandments also neglects the commandments of God. Certainly what I have taught you is not my teaching without also being the Father's teaching; rather, it is more the Father's than mine, for from him comes all my power and my teaching. I do nothing except on the authority of him by whom I was sent into the world to teach what I teach.[37] And I have said this to you as suits your capacity, since I still go as a mortal among mortals; I will soon visit you again, for some days to carry on our companionship as an immortal with mortals, to comfort, instruct, and advise you. I am well aware that what I am now saying and what I will say shortly after my death you will not fully understand because you are still unspiritual and ignorant; but it is not said by me to no purpose. For after I have taken this body from you, when you ask in my name another comforter[38] will come to you, not in bodily form as you see me, but the Holy Spirit, sanctifier of spirits and minds, whom the Father will send to you in my place when you have asked him in my name. And you will not hereafter be in need of my physical presence, which has been temporarily granted to mortals' dullness so that by degrees they may advance to more perfect things. For since the Spirit is mine and the Father's, he will supply to your memory everything that I am saying to you, ignorant as you are, and insufficiently capable, and forgetful besides; and he will make you understand what you had not understood before, and will not let you forget anything, nor will he allow you to be in ignorance of what concerns salvation. He will make you mindful instead of forgetful, good learners instead of slow, watchful instead of drowsy, eager instead of mournful, heavenly instead of earthly. Only be steadfast in love, remembering my commandments.

'And there is no reason why you should now be disheartened by the world's tumult that you see rising against me, and that some day will rise against you too. Let it be enough for you that as I depart I leave you peace, that I give you my peace. Whoever has my peace cannot be overturned by any storm in the world. The world too has a peace of its own, and it gives its peace to those it loves, but it is an untrustworthy peace. My peace that I am giving to you joins you to God. For who could harm one who has God as his protector? The peace I leave you, attaching you to each other in mutual harmony,[39] will make your friendship invincible against everything that the world or Satan the prince of the world can do. Why, then, should my departure dishearten you so greatly, since it is also going to bring you considerable advantage? So do not let your heart be troubled or smitten with fear. You have already heard – and so that you may believe more fully, I say it again and again – that I am going away for a time, but only to return to you soon; in the mean time I will see to it that I find you unharmed. This storm will now wreak its violence on me alone. Soon after I have returned to the Father, I will be with you again in the Spirit, the comforter; the Father will also be with you in the same person, and we will never be torn from you until you are completely with us in the kingdom of heaven. You grieve because I am going away. But if you truly loved me, you would rejoice on both your own account and mine, because I am not going away just anywhere, but am returning to the Father, to get greater things from him for you, since *the Father is greater than I* and from him comes whatever I bestow on you. If it is for me that you are afraid and for my sake that you grieve, it would be more fitting to wish me joy because I am being taken away from the evils of this world and am going back to fellowship with the Father. But if you are mourning for your own sakes – my departure will bring you a great benefit.

'I know that I am saying these things to people who are neither very alert nor very comprehending. But I repeat them and insist on them so that when the outcome of events confirms what I have said, you will believe that all the rest will also be true that I foretold would come to pass later on. From now on I will not speak much as a mortal with mortals. For the time is near when I will be taken from you in body. Satan, the prince of this world,[40] is here in his henchmen, and he will make an attack on me with all his might to hurl me down and annihilate me. But there is no danger from him. For he *has no authority over me,* and in the moment when he assures himself that he is the conqueror, he will find himself conquered and overthrown. He has no authority except over those who are in bondage to sin. But since the world is fettered by its faults, he wields tyranny over the worshippers of the world. For I do not die under compulsion or for any wrongdoing, but so that by my death I may release my members from the tyranny of sin and death. This was commanded me by my Father, and I do what was commanded in accordance with his judgment.

'And now we have been at table long enough. It is time, since we carry out the Father's bidding willingly, for us to meet the death that is fast approaching.[41] So rise, and let us leave here.'[42]

Our Lord Jesus saw that his disciples were in many ways bewildered in spirit: partly out of grief, because they saw the imminence of the Lord's death, whom they loved with only a human love to be sure, but very passionately; partly out of fear of the evils which they saw awaiting themselves when he had gone; and they were furthermore heavy with sleep, which the night brought on and their grief increased, and the long sitting contributed its sluggishness to their spirits. He bade them rise so that having thus shaken off the sluggishness they would be made readier for the things he was going to say; and at the same time he hinted in a riddling fashion that it was now time for them to raise their hearts from earthly feelings to the things that are heavenly, from the mortal to the immortal, from the temporal to the eternal.[43] He also wanted it to be impressed on their minds that whatever he was going to suffer he suffered knowingly and willingly, with the Father indeed willing it thus, but from the Father's will his own will never dissented. He wanted his followers, as much as human weakness allowed, to be witnesses and observers of his punishment, and in this conversation he repeatedly mentioned his departure just so that they would gradually become accustomed to bear it.[44] But he meanwhile mixed in many comforts to soften the bitterness of the pain: that he was indeed going, but only to return to them soon; that he was going to the Father; that from there he would send another comforter to complete what he had begun; that he also, along with the Father, would come and make his dwelling among them; that this storm would not destroy them. In fact he even led them away into another place because the place where they were was widely known and since they had heard that the prince of this world was near, they feared for themselves in the common danger. And so he led them off into another place, as safer for them, so that they could hear the rest with more trusting hearts. And finally, he foretold that they themselves would in the end follow him to the place where he was now going on ahead. Now he returned to those words which had to settle deep in their minds, in which he had warned them to be steadfast in love and in keeping his commandments, lest they separate themselves by their own fault from the fellowship of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, from which Judas had already torn himself away; they were instead to continue in the bond, obey the words of their Lord, and as best they could imitate his deeds. But he said that this could not happen unless they were steadfast in the spiritual fellowship of the Son, and that they should not rely on themselves or claim anything for their own powers, for they could never prevail at all except by the Lord's gift, from whom flows forth to all everything that makes for true salvation. So that they would understand it better and keep it more firmly in mind, he explained the point by using a metaphor[45] from something quite well known, the vine and its branches.

Chapter 15

'So that you may thoroughly understand,' he said, 'how there is no danger for you if you are steadfast in my fellowship, but how much danger there is if you forsake the bond I have made with you and are torn away: remember that I am the true vine and you the branches, while my Father is the vine-dresser. I am the root or stock of the vine, and you are my limbs, like branches growing from the stock. The Father planted me, for he is the one who begot me. From him the stock came forth, and you from the stock. The thanks for the entire benefit goes back to the Father as the source, who bestows through me and his Spirit all that he bestows on you. But the sap of the stock, which gives life and the power to bear fruit to the branches as well, is the Spirit common to the Father and me.[1] As he binds me to the Father, so he also joins you to me. So every branch holding fast to me and living on my Spirit that bears fruit worthy of its stock will be pruned by my Father, who will cut away the useless lusts[2] so that it may bear finer and more abundant fruit. On the other hand, whoever clings to me declaring his faith but bears no fruit of gospel love will be cut away[3] from the vine by my Father as a burdensome and fruitless limb. For he who has no fruit but only leaves is on the vine to no purpose.

'You indeed are already now branches pruned and trimmed by my words in which you have believed, but later you will have to be pruned even more so that you bear more abundant fruit.[4] For now it is enough for you to be grafted onto the stock from which by faith you draw life. See to it that you remain on me, and I in turn will act in you who hang on me. For as the branch, if it is torn from its vine, cannot by itself make any fruit, because whatever sap it has it draws from the stock; so neither can you produce the fruit of any good work unless you hold fast to me by faith and love,[5] for from that must come to you everything that makes for true and eternal salvation. Neither Moses nor any of the prophets is a vine; I am the one vine to which anyone who wants to bring forth the fruit of salvation must cling. You are the branches of this vine, on which you are grafted without your own doing and pruned without your own doing, but from which you can fall away by your own fault. Hence you must take care to be joined to me always. For whoever stays joined to me, keeping me likewise joined to himself and living on my Spirit, at the Father's inspiration bears abundant fruit, earning for himself eternal salvation and winning for God, by whose grace all things come to be, glory among mortals. And God's glory is my glory, for it has pleased him to bestow through me all that he bestows on humankind for the attainment of eternal salvation. So remember that apart from me you cannot do any good thing.

'But if by his own fault a branch tears himself from me his stock, he not only produces no fruit, but just as a useless branch, cut away by the pruning knife, dries out and soon is gathered up with the rest of the cuttings[6] and is thrown into the fire to be burned, likewise when he is deprived of my sap and spirit, he dies in his mind, even if he lives in the body. And after this life, irreparably separated from the vine, he is thrown into the eternal fire, to burn forever as his punishment because he refused to stay on the vine to produce the fruit of everlasting bliss.[7]

'But you will remain in me if my words remain in you; if you hold fast to what you believe; if you carry out in your actions the things to which you hold fast. If you do this, there is no reason for you to fear any mortal storms, and if I am not yet present in the body, my Father will still hear you, and I myself too will hear you if you ask for what you want; and whatever you ask for you will receive. But just as by yourselves you have nothing from which you can produce fruit, so you should not claim for yourselves the glory of good deeds. For as I have not sought my own glory but the glory of the Father, from whom proceeds all that I am or can do, so you will return all thanks and all glory for good deeds to my Father and me. In this way the glory of the Father will be made known among humans, if they see you bearing as much gospel fruit as possible. For whatever glory comes to me from you redounds to the glory of the Father, for whom it will yield praise among humans if they see that you are true disciples of the Son, not because we have need of human glory but because thus it is best for the salvation of the human race, for which we thirst.

'It is a sign of love, not of self-seeking, that the Father wishes to be glorified in this way among humankind. As the Father has loved me, the stock, I likewise have loved you, my branches. Keep so great a benefit as this, freely given, with much care, lest you lose it by your heedlessness. But it will not be lost if, as I have been steadfast to death in the Father's love, always desiring his glory, so you are steadfast in my love. And you will be steadfast if you keep not the commandments of the Pharisees or of the philosophers but my commandments; and nothing in this world either enticing or alarming will be able to distract you from them, just as I steadfastly do my Father's bidding even to death, not drawing back from his love but making known by my very actions that I answer his love for me with like love for him. Hence, just as it will be to the Father's glory to have such a Son, truly his own and worthy of himself, so it will be to the glory of us both that I have you, disciples who keep my words and imitate my deeds.

'Though this has some pain mixed with it, still I impress it on you at such length for this reason: so that as I have not sought the joy of this world but rejoice in the fact that, being obedient to my Father's bidding, I am loved by my Father, similarly you do not seek comfort from the world but rejoice in my joy whenever you are afflicted as you walk in my footsteps; and so that such joy remain in you, always growing greater and better, until it is fulfilled in the everlasting bliss of immortal life. In the midst of your troubles you will have much comfort in your mutual love. The commandments of the Pharisees are numerous, and those of Moses are many also; this is the one commandment properly mine,[8] which embraces all that I teach, which will sweeten all the griefs that happen: that you embrace each other in that love in which I have enfolded you.

'I give evidence of my love not in words only but in deeds as well, and I give evidence that it is not an ordinary love but an outstanding one, and one as great as can possibly exist among humans, among whom no proof of love is greater than if someone expends his life for a friend. For the life dearest to each person is his own. Perhaps quite a few people will be found to expend their money or effort. One who would expend his life for a friend is rare. I do more, for I expend my life even for my enemies, if only they will become my friends. And now to honour you I am calling you friends, those whom by rights I could call slaves. But I will not consider you as slaves but as friends, if, as I willingly obey my Father's bidding, you too carry out eagerly and gladly what I command you. Those who are worshippers of the law are rightly called slaves,[9] since they are dependent on numerous instructions and do what they are told out of fear rather than willingly. But as for you, whom I have called from the slavery of the law to gospel freedom, from now on I will not call you servants but friends, since it is not necessity that joins you to me but mutual love. For the slave does not understand what his master intends; he only does what he is ordered to do, expecting no great reward if he does it but likely to be beaten if he disregards his orders. And there have to be specific instructions for specific tasks: go, come, do this, don't do that.[10] For the master does not entrust his intentions to his slaves, who are untrustworthy because they fear more than they love. But I have called you friends because I have once and for all shared the whole intention of my heart with you, so that now there is no need for new instructions from humans. Whatever the Father wanted you to know through me, I have shared with you as with trusted friends.[11] What I have taught you is fact, for I have taught nothing other than what I heard from my Father. My commands are his commands, and if you keep them, to him also you will be not slaves but friends.

'And so that you may understand better how great is the honour of this regard for you: you have not summoned me to friendship by your services, so that returning your love is a matter of what is owed you; nor did you voluntarily come to my friendship, so that loving those who love me is a matter of common decency. But it was I who, when you were slaves of the law and separated from the friendship of God, willingly and voluntarily chose you out of all the rest, though you had done nothing to deserve it. And I have chosen you to the end that, grafted in me by the shared love which you would not have for me if I had not loved you first, you might always grow better. As the branch is always nourished by the sap of the vine, spreading itself more widely in its growing, so you also are to bring forth the abundant fruit of the gospel in all the regions of the world, and you are to benefit others in such a way that your fruit remains unharmed for yourselves also. For the ordinary vine bears fruit for others, and perishable fruit at that, and so its branches bear a short-lived fruit, because they hold fast to a vine that will die. Since you hold fast to an immortal stock, you will bear a fruit that will never die but that you will have safe for eternal life. And now there is no reason for you to say, "It is a huge task to face the world, to teach the nations, to endure the hatred of wicked people. What wages, what protection, what reward is set for us?" Say farewell to such worldly protections. Let this be in place of all protections and rewards, that whatever you ask the Father in my name, he is going to give you. What is easier than to ask? And what is there that he cannot bestow? What then is there that he does not want for my sake? And my bidding is not harsh. For what is sweeter than mutual love? Who is so weak that shared love does not make him strong? What is so mournful that mutual affection does not make it sweet?

'And do not be disturbed because while you have friendship with me, while you cling to each other in mutual affection, you will have conflict and hostility with the world. In fact that very experience should comfort your hearts, since by this proof you will learn that you are truly my disciples and friends, that is, that you are separated from the world, which is completely set in wickedness while you are destined for heaven. It should not seem shameful that you suffer in the world what I suffered before you.[12] The world hates me too, not because I deserve it but because I prove and reveal its wickedness, teaching things that do not suit its worldly feelings. The world knows the people of its sect, and it embraces and exalts them, as like loves like and a bad itch loves a good scratch.[13] Therefore those to whom the world is fawning and friendly are wretched. For that proves that they are separated from God's friendship, which alone makes people truly happy. But if the world hates you, recognize my example and congratulate yourselves because you are separated from the fellowship of the world but are holding fast to my comradeship. For you will learn from the world's hatred that you are on my side. For if you belonged to the world, if you loved the things of this world, if you taught the things that suit worldly desires, the world would recognize you and love you as its own; but since you follow not the things of the flesh but the things of the spirit, since you do not pant for earthly goods but heavenly ones, that is why the world hates you: not because you deserve to be hated but because you are unlike what is evil and sinful. Before, when you located perfect righteousness in the stupid ceremonies of the law, when you were intent on transitory things and were held by no love for heavenly things, the world loved you. But after I called you away from that sect to the heavenly gospel teaching, and grafted you to me like branches to a stock, the world began to hate you for no other reason except that you are mine.

'Yet you will be happy on no other account than that you are mine. Do not be surprised that your innocence will not protect you from the world's hatred. Remember what I have said to you: the position of the slave is no better than that of his master. My innocence was not able to protect me from the world's hatred, though it is greater than your innocence; nor did they fear to scorn my teaching, and they could not be softened by my good deeds and recalled from their cruel undertakings. What they dared to do to me, who am their Lord and master, they will much more dare to do to you. If they have persecuted me with so many plots to the point of a death that is far and away the most shameful, if they have assailed me with insults so many times, they will also persecute you, my disciples, or rather they will persecute me in you. If they obey my words they will obey yours also. But as they have not endured my teaching, likewise they will not endure yours either, since you will teach the same things that I am teaching.

'But whatever abuse they hurl at you, I will regard as done to me. For whatever they are going to do to you they will do from hatred of my name. They will be cursing me when they curse you; they will be rejecting me when they reject you; they will be murdering me when they murder you. For whatever is done to the members counts as abuse to the head. And they would do such things to me if they had me among them. Since they will not then be able to do anything to me, they will commit violence against you. So just as all the abuse offered to you counts as abuse of me, likewise whatever is done against my name counts as abuse of my Father; for if they truly knew him as they think they know him, they would by no means inflict such great insults on his Son. They claim for themselves piety towards God, and towards his Son they are impious. They seek salvation from God, and for his Son they scheme destruction. They boast that they keep God's commandments, and the Son's commandments, which he gives on his Father's authority, they reject. They boast of their knowledge of the law, and they do not recognize him whom the law foretells. They worship the sender and assail the one he has sent. Therefore they do not know God, whom they boast that they know. And yet this ignorance will not excuse them on the day of retribution. They are ignorant, true, but they are ignorant because they have refused to learn. They have refused to learn because they have loved their own glory more than the glory of God. They have valued their own profit more than gaining the gospel salvation. And so what the Father has done for their salvation they turned by their own stubbornness against themselves, to crown their eternal damnation. For I came, I was sent, for this purpose: to bestow on everyone, if possible, eternal salvation.

'If I had not come myself, I the Son, than whom no greater could be sent;[14] if I had not said to them all the things that could recall them to a better frame of mind; if I had not done things that could drive even hearts of stone to believe, then they surely would have perished more lightly, free, that is, from this charge of unbelief, the addition of which will add a heavy load to their destruction. But since in fact I left out nothing by which they could be saved, since they themselves with their persistent hatred fought against him who offers them salvation freely given, they have no way to excuse their unbelief. If anyone out of hatred makes an attack on a person unknown to him, it seems he must somehow be forgiven if he hates someone he has never seen.[15] They have seen me and heard me. They have seen me doing good to everyone, they have heard me speaking things befitting God, and yet they hate me for the very things for which they ought to love me. So whoever hates me cannot help but hate my Father, by whose authority I say what I say and by whose power I do anything I do. For I did not speak to them in words only but also in deeds. They in their blindness have believed neither the words nor the deeds. And this very thing will make the evil of their damnation worse, that they have so persistently misused the goodness of God that was before them. If I had not done miracles among them such as none of the prophets before me did, whether one considers their greatness or their number, and every miracle not to frighten them but to aid the suffering,[16] they would not be in the grip of this sin, the gravest by far. But as it is, they both heard and saw, and so much the more have they hated not only me, who spoke and acted, but my Father too, who spoke through me and through me showed his might. They have never seen Moses and yet they marvel at him; they believe in the prophets, whom they never heard. As for me, whom they have seen face to face, whom they have heard speaking, whom they have learned to know as a doer of good deeds in so many ways, they turn away from me, and not content with that, they inflict death upon me. And now they pretend to devotion to God the Father, though one who truly loves the Father cannot hate the Son.

'Yet these things are not happening by accident, since the prophecies in the Psalms, which they hold to and read, have foretold that what they are doing would happen some day, that is, that for the good deeds for which thanks were owed, they would return ill will. For that is what I say through the mouth of the prophet: 'Let them not rejoice over me who oppose me unjustly, who hate me without reason.'[17] It is endurable if someone hates another when he has cause; in any case it can be forgiven if someone hates an unknown person;[18] but who would pardon one who out of hatred makes an attack on an acquaintance and benefactor?

'But the unbelief of such persons will not render useless the fruit of those who hold fast to me. For when I have completed all that the Father has commanded me, and the comforter[19] has come whom, as I promised earlier, I will send to you, who proceeds from the Father, I mean the Spirit who is the supplier and teacher of all truth, he will make all that I have said and done plain; and hence my goodness and their stubborn blindness will be clear. The Spirit will teach that nothing was done to me that had not been already foretold in their books, which they read and do not understand. You too, who are now weak, will then be strengthened by the inspiration of my Spirit and will bear witness among all people about me, because you saw what I did, you heard what I said as it took place. As I have reported to you trustworthy things, that is, what I saw and heard with my Father, and as the Spirit will supply you with equally trustworthy things, that is, himself also proceeding from the Father, so you too will be witnesses[20] not of doubtful events but of events experienced by all your senses. But there will be those who will not have faith in you either; yet the saving of others is not to be abandoned because of those who are lost by their own fault.'

Chapter 16

'And no dangers should deter you from the proclamation of the gospel truth, a truth which the world will indeed assail with all its craft but will never be able to suppress because the gospel truth relies on God as its warrant. You see what the world is plotting against me because of my proclamation of my Father's truth. You must prepare your hearts to undergo like suffering.[1] I am telling you that these things will come about lest you suppose the proclamation of the gospel to be an agreeable business and then become dismayed when such things happen contrary to your expectation. For evils that are anticipated and against which the heart has been steadied before they occur are less distressing.[2] I will not deceive you either about the evils that must be endured for the gospel's sake or about the rewards that await those who carry out their task diligently. This is the first thing that will confront you when you begin preaching the gospel: those who appear to uphold the citadel of religion, who proclaim their knowledge of the law, will remove you from their synagogues as sinful and accursed, which is the most degrading penalty they have. Soon they will not be content with that; it will come to prisons and beatings.[3] Finally it will reach the point that whoever kills you will think he is offering a sacrifice most pleasing to God. For they will cloak their sinfulness in the appearance of godliness, and the teachers of true godliness they will prosecute on charges of sinfulness. The result will be that you will not only suffer harsh things but you will also suffer as if you were sinful and evildoers.

'But do not be concerned about how the world judges you. Let my example comfort you, as you recall that you endure these sufferings with me and for my sake and my Father's sake. The injustice is to us; it will be our task both to supply you aid in your struggle and to bestow rewards on you in your victory as well as to oppose your persecutors and exact the penalty from those who resist, lest you have any thoughts of vengeance. For they will not commit such wrongs against you because you are thieves or slanderers or otherwise deserving of such ills, but because they do not yet fully know either me or my Father. The error combined with their savagery will make you even have compassion on them, and you are to think not so much that they should be destroyed by punishment as that they should be saved by teaching. For religious zeal will stir up many against you, but they will be mistaken more in their judgment than in their feeling.[4] They will repent as soon as my Father becomes known through you to the world, as soon as they learn my teaching and the power of the Holy Spirit from what you preach. I know that you are saddened at my departure, and you did not need grief added to grief, but it was best to warn you about these things ahead of time, so that when these ills befall you, you may bear them bravely and with spirits unbroken, as long as you recall that I foretold that all this would happen, and that you suffer as I did, at the hands of the sinful, at the hands of those ignorant of the truth, for my sake and my Father's.[5] And do not let people's judgment about you trouble you, content in your consciousness of the right. On the contrary, in accordance with my teaching judge yourselves blessed when people persecute you, when they say every sort of evil against you falsely for my name's sake.[6] They will ban you from the synagogues, but this very act will prove that your names are enrolled in heaven.

'I knew that all this would happen to you, but in the beginning, when I was joining you to myself, I said nothing about it, not to deceive you but because it was not yet time, for not everything is suitable for every occasion. The temporary presence of this body nursed your weakness. Now since the time is coming for me to be removed from you, you had to be warned openly about what you are going to endure, so that you may gradually become used to being without the comfort of my bodily presence and, putting aside your human feelings, may take on more surely and fully a manly strength of heart, and not be like children who always cling to their mother's lap, terrified whenever they have to be whisked out of sight of their parents.[7] I did not want to suckle you on false hope, but neither did I want to throw your hearts into confusion at the wrong time. What your weakness required has been given it, and as the occasion demanded I have acted as comforter and advocate.[8] Now I must depart, and though it is particularly for your sake that I go, so that when the sight of this body is taken away you may advance to braver things, still, my words have so disheartened you that no one is asking or thinking where I am going – and yet you ought not be pained because I depart but should rather rejoice because I am going to the Father from whom I came, never more to be absent from you, but to be with you in a different way.

'And I know quite well what would be more to your affection's liking. You would rather have enjoyed this companionship with me permanently.[9] But I have preferred to tell you what profits you rather than what pleases you; I have preferred that you know the truth and grieve for a time rather than not advance to a steadiness that will be equal to the coming storm. And that is why I am now openly telling you what will happen, that I will leave you and that when I am taken away you will endure much suffering. So that you may be fit to bear that, it is best for you that I be taken from your sight now. For unless your sight of my body is taken away and you begin to be spiritual, the Spirit, the comforter,[10] who will make you strong and invincible, will not come to you.[11] Indeed, I have prepared you for him and he will complete what was begun in you by me. And in short, through him I will always be with you, and I will be nearer in my absence than I am now in being present. For I did not come to live with you forever on earth, but I lowered myself to your feebleness in order to raise you into heaven.[12] This is the way it seemed best to my Father's purpose, in the dispensation of the passage of time,[13] to advance you gradually and by stages to that which is perfect. And it is right that you too adapt your hearts to my Father's direction. All things will come to you by our kindness, but it is your task to strive to be fit for our kindness. For if you remain permanently in the state of mind in which you now are, the heavenly comforter will not come to you, for you clearly will not yet be fit for his gift. But if I depart and you, giving up my bodily presence, prepare your hearts for the higher gifts that the Spirit will bring to you, then the comforter sent by me will come from the Father, never to leave you or desert you, neither in life nor in death.

'And the Spirit will not be without effect, but when he comes will effect through you more than I now do[14] – not because our power is not the same but because it is best for the salvation of the human race that the parts of the task be divided among eras. I have accused the world; he will do the same more fully and clearly. For he will so prove the world's guilt that unless it repents and believes in the gospel, it will have no excuse at all. For in so far as the feebleness of my flesh now offers the world cause for offence, it would seem to offer something with which the world can cloak its unbelief. They have seen me weary, they have seen me hungry and thirsty, they have seen me lowly and despised; soon they will see me set upon, captive, beaten, and at last dying. But when all that pertains to the dispensation of the flesh has been completed, when they see that I live again, when they see me lifted into the heavens and you suddenly made fearless heralds of my name by the sending of the Spirit, when they see marvellous powers flashing forth at the invocation of my name, demons dispelled, the lame made whole, the sick healed, the dead brought back to life, in short that everything foretold by the prophets has taken place – then no excuse will be left for the sinful and unbelieving.[15] For then the world will be proved inexorably guilty on a triple charge: first of sin, next of righteousness, and last of judgment.

'It will be proved guilty of the greatest sin of all, which embraces all the other sins.[16] For when they see that the predictions of the prophets agree with events; when they observe so many thousands of people proclaiming my name; when they see those who have believed in me receive the Holy Spirit and speak in unknown tongues, become famous for their miraculous deeds, abandon the superstition of the law of Moses, embrace the gospel religion, forswear their ancestral worship of idols and instead worship the heavenly Father in holiness of life, count earthly goods as nothing, be completely transported to heavenly things – then what will the world have to cloak its stubborn unbelief? If nothing is left undone by the Father who sent me, nothing undone by me who was sent to save everyone, nothing undone by the Holy Spirit whom we two shall send, nothing undone by you, whom that heavenly Spirit will use as his instruments, then what is left except for everyone to understand that they perish by fault of their own unbelief? And when they observe that heathen peoples are washed of the sins of their former lives and endowed with innocence through baptism in plain water[17] and proclamation of my name, it will be evident that they willingly and knowingly remain in their filth and add sin to sin.

'And the world will be proved guilty also of the false claim of righteousness.[18] For now in one way or another they cloak themselves in their observance of the law handed down from God; they boast of the regulations of their ancestors that they keep; they cloak themselves in the religion handed down by their ancestors, the fasts, the sabbaths, the prayers, the almsgivings, the ceremonies, and other things of that kind that have the appearance of righteousness. But when they see that the wonderful power of the Spirit comes to none but those who have proclaimed my name, that it comes even to idolaters, without observance of the law, what will they say then, those who claim righteousness for themselves from their observance of the law? In vain will they boast among mankind of their false righteousness, since they rejected him through whom alone true righteousness is attained. It will be clear to the world that this is so at the time when the Spirit makes it known that I, whom they nailed to the cross, whom they buried, am not dead, but have returned to the Father from whom I came, am living with him, and, now invisible and removed from human sight, am accomplishing more through you, who are inspired by my

Spirit, than I accomplished while here on earth.[19] The result of these events will be that the unrighteousness of those who put their hope of righteousness elsewhere than in me will be proven; and that the righteousness of God will be glorified, righteousness that faithfully carries out for the human race what he once promised through his prophets. And this will happen soon. For through death I am going to my Father, and I will not be here with you in this visible body for long, and yet you will understand that I am alive and empowered, and that I do not fail to fulfil anything of what I have promised.

'Furthermore, the world will also be proven guilty of judgment. The reason is that when people everywhere turn from their sins to innocence of life, when they betake themselves from the coarse ceremonies of the Mosaic law to gospel holiness, when all the nations of the world turn from worshipping demons and idols to the worship of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, it will become clear that the prince of this world, who thus far has wielded his tyranny by means of sin, is then defeated, cast out, and condemned by his own weapons. For he is the one who will have achieved my death, and it is through me that the sins of the world are taken away,[20] innocence is bestowed, the gospel freedom is granted, immortality is given. Then it will be clear that what seemed to be disgrace was triumph, what was thought to be destruction was victory. For when demons everywhere are cast out of temples, when they howl at the sign of the cross, when at my name they leave bodies they have long possessed, will it not be plain that their prince is condemned? Will it not be evident that those also are rightly to be condemned who prefer to follow the condemned and defeated one into eternal death[21] rather than follow me, whom God has raised as victor to share in his kingdom, who am the source of innocence and life for all?

'There are many other things that I could say to you, but this is not the time to bring them up, and you are not yet capable of understanding them, because of your weakness and of the still unfinished state of my mission;[22] I leave them for the Spirit who is to come. When he comes he will find you more capable of fuller knowledge, for the appointed task of my death, resurrection, and ascension will be finished. He will not be an idle or human spirit, but my Spirit, that is, the Spirit of truth. He will teach[23] you all truth of which you are not now fully capable. He too will speak to you, but in silent and secret inspirations. He will not strike the ears of your body by the movement of air but will move the innermost part of your mind by his hidden power. And he will not say unreliable things, but as I have said nothing that I did not hear while with my Father, so he will supply nothing but what he has received from the Father and from me. And he will not only reveal to you all truth about things gone by, but also as often as the situation requires he will tell you what is to be before it happens. For he is not only almighty but also all-knowing. Through you he will make the glory of my name bright, just as through my death and resurrection I will make the glory of the Father bright.[24] For as anything I do advances the glory of the Father from whom I am and from whom I have received everything, so whatever the Spirit does through you will advance my glory. For he will supply to you nothing different from what I have received from the Father and handed on to you. Among us there is nothing that is not common to all. All things come from the Father,[25] but nothing is his that is not also mine, and nothing is the Father's or mine that is not shared with the Spirit. So I shall speak to you through him, as the Father has spoken through me. Whoever believes in me believes in the Father; whoever believes in the Spirit will believe in both of us.[26]

'Strengthened by all these things, put on a brave heart against the coming storm, and in times of affliction preserve yourselves for the better things that will follow. There is a short time when you will be bereft of the sight of me, but it will not be long. For after a brief interval I will be returned again to your sight, so that you may gradually grow accustomed to being without the sight of this body, a sight that is useless to you. For I am going back to the Father to bestow on you greater things when I have ceased being visible to you.'

But so much grief had taken over the disciples' hearts by then that they neither understood nor remembered what had been so often repeated.[27] For our Lord Jesus indicated not particularly obscurely in these words that by death and burial he would be out of his followers' sight but that after three days he would again be seen by them, in a body that was indeed the same but now immortal, so that once his disciples' hearts had been strengthened for some few days he might return to heaven; and then, once the sight of his body, which did not allow them to be spiritual, had been taken away, they would be deserving of the heavenly Spirit and not look for the physical presence of the Lord except when on the last day he will show himself once and for all to all the nations of the world, to judge the living and the dead.[28] In spite of this, not understanding what had been said, the disciples murmured to each other, 'What does this talk mean? "There is a little while when you will not see me and again there is a little while when you will see me, because I am going to the Father." How will we see him if he is going off to the Father? Or what is the meaning of this "little while" when he will take the possibility of seeing him away from us? And again another "little while" when he will make it possible for us to see him? This is mysterious talk, and we do not understand what he is saying.'

But Jesus, understanding that they had in mind to ask him what his words meant, anticipated their questions in order to show, as was his habit, that people's thoughts no matter how secret were known to him.[29] 'Again it troubles your hearts,' he said, 'that I said that for a little while the sight of me is to be taken from you and again for a little while the sight of me will be given back to you, because it is not useful to stay among you permanently as I am now doing, but it is more in your interest that I go to the Father. What I said is quite true. The time is coming when you will be consumed with grief, sorrow, and tears because this companionship of ours has been taken away, despairing at heart as if you were stripped of every resource. The world on the other hand will rejoice as a victor, it will exult and be jubilant, but soon the situation will be reversed, for the world's joy will be turned into sadness and your sadness will be turned to joy. For as my death will pain you and bring the Jews[30] joy, so my resurrection will bring you joy and conversely confound the Jews. Therefore bear that short grief bravely, in hope of the joy soon to follow. Just so is a pregnant woman in great agony as she struggles to give birth, but she bears the pains courageously because she knows they will not last long, and she will soon have pleasure from the birth of the child. For as soon as she delivers the child with which she was in labour, so great is her pleasure in having become the mother of a new baby[31] that she does not remember the pain she suffered in the delivery; on the contrary she is happy to have gotten herself a long-lasting joy at the cost of a short-lived pain. Likewise you too, for this short time that is now at hand, will be in agony of heart, and even now you are in the grip of great sadness. But in a few short days, when I have presented myself to you alive again and victorious, your heart will overflow with great joy, because him whom you mourned as dead you will see endowed with undying life. Your mourning will be short but your joy everlasting. For death passes away; undying life remains.

'At present there is much about which your heart longs to question me; soon your hearts and eyes will be so satisfied that you will think there is nothing more to ask. For the great joy will shatter all your heart's trouble, and your prayers will seek nothing further when you see more offered than you hoped or dared to wish for. And yet after I am taken away from you into heaven, you will lack nothing. For what is easier than to ask from the Father? And whatever you ask from him in my name will be given to you. What need do you have of other resources? The Father alone can do all things, and he is not going to deny anything to my friends and those who ask in my name. Until now my bodily presence has prevented you from asking him anything worthy of my name. For you do not yet depend entirely on heavenly resources but in a human kind of emotion you are dependent on this body. From now on lift your hearts to heaven, for you must know that there I will be your ever-present advocate,[32] and ask; and whatever you ask for you shall receive, so that soon your joy, which will come to you after the sadness which you now feel, when the sight of me is restored, may be full and unending. For then there will not be alternations of sadness and joy from the removal and return of my availability in this body's feeble form; but if you rely always on the heavenly protection prepared for you, if you have the Spirit ever-present as your comforter and counsellor, you will enjoy the never-failing bliss of assurance, in both happiness and woe giving thanks to God.

'At present I have said these things to you in a rather cryptic and puzzling fashion because you do not yet fully understand what I am saying. For I must bow in this way to your weakness so that you too may learn to make allowance for the weakness of others. But the time will come, after this mortal body has been taken away and you are stronger and have put off your sadness, when you will be readier to hear and I will speak to you about my Father openly and not under cover of parables. For now, because your heart is weak and taken up with cares, even what is said to you openly is like a parable.[33] In the end, through my Spirit too I shall announce definitely to you what my Father wills. For it is not right for you to be in ignorance of my Father's will. At that time I shall indeed speak silently, but I shall say unmistakable things, I shall say understandable things, if you will only ask. But the heavenly Spirit will also supply what you are to ask for and how you are to ask in my name.[34] If you do this, even if it were something difficult and hard to attain, still if you ask for my sake my Father would not refuse you. Now I do not mean that you will get your request by my intervention in the way that people often get their requests from a human prince, by the advocacy of someone who is in favour with the prince. A prince would not otherwise be inclined to be generous unless he were granting it to the favour of the one who recommends the petitioner's request.[35] Quite the contrary – although the Father loves to be asked through the Son, through whom he has chosen to bestow everything on mortals, still he will gladly and willingly smile on your prayers otherwise: not only because of the love that he has for the Son but also because of the love that he has for you. For he does not love the Son to the exclusion of loving you, but whomever the Son loves the Father loves also. Hence he loves you not for the sake of what you do but for the reason that you return my love, because you believe that I have come from him. For to love the Son is to love the Father, and to believe in the Son is to believe in the Father. But whoever denies that the Son came from the Father, that he says and does everything on the Father's authority, is not a believer. Before I took on the mortal body that you see and came into the world, I was already with the Father. But for your sake I came into the world, to lift you into heaven.[36] Having carried out what the Father commanded me for your sake, I in my bodily presence am now leaving the world again and returning to the Father. And whatever is done or will be done here, is done and will be done for the sake of your salvation.'

Heartened by these words the disciples began to be a little pleased with themselves, as if they could withstand the approaching death of their Lord on their own strength. They replied in this way: 'Look, what you promise to do later you are fulfilling right now. For now without the cover of parables you are saying openly what you will do, and we don't need to ask you anything further. Nothing escapes you,[37] and with these words you have taken the sadness from our heart, and there will be no need for other talk. For we have no doubt that in hope of the joy to come we will endure what is at hand with steadfast hearts. And now at last we really believe that you have come from God, because you have a full view of the secrets of our innermost hearts.' Our Lord Jesus' habit was everywhere to put a sharp check on any human arrogance, self-seeking, or self-confidence that he perceived welling up in his disciples' hearts, so that they would clearly learn to put no faith in their own strength, by which they could accomplish nothing, but would depend entirely on the protection of God the Father. So he then blunted that arrogance, because although they did not yet understand what he had said, did not really believe, were not yet equal to the approaching storms, they were nonetheless claiming for themselves what had to be asked for from the Father in prayer. He replied in this way: 'What is this I hear? Are you prematurely claiming for yourselves, as if you could do anything at all by the resources of human might, what I promise you later on, when you have become stronger by my teaching and the inspiration of the Spirit? Surely not; the time is now at hand when you will make clear how feeble you are in your own selves. For not only will you not endure the coming storm bravely, but you will leave me alone in the hands of the public attendants who will hurry me off to the punishment of the cross, and you will all flee in different directions; your hearts will be so confused with fear that you will not only not stay by me but you will not even be an aid and comfort to each other in your shared fellowship, while each one will be afraid for himself lest he be betrayed or put at risk by another's informing. And yet I at least will have no need of your protection – I shall indeed be deserted by all my friends, but I will not be comfortless, because my Father will never abandon me. I say this to you so that you may mistrust your own strength and rest in me. The world will rise against you with great tumult, as it is now rising against me. But be courageous, remembering that I have conquered the world. You will take your model from me, you will hope for aid from me. You too will conquer, but through me, feeble in your own nature indeed, but strong and invincible in my spirit, when time and circumstance require.'[38]

Chapter 17

With words of this kind Jesus had both comforted his disciples and also instructed and prepared them against the coming storm of evils.[1] Now since he had warned them that they were not to put their confidence in human powers but in heavenly protection, he wanted to teach his followers by his very action that when the assaults of the world came crowding in they were to look nowhere else than to the heavenly Father, for those who wished to be equal to enduring the persecutions had to put their whole dependence in him.[2] So raising his eyes to heaven, in order to teach them, of course, by his very posture where their heart was to be directed, he spoke in this way: 'Father, the time I have always wished for is now here; glorify your Son among mankind in death and resurrection,[3] so that in turn your Son may glorify you among all mortals, and each of us become known through the other.[4] Indeed, the salvation of the human race is advanced in this way, that the world come to know the Son through you and come to know the Father in turn through the Son. For it has seemed best to you to entrust to the Son power over the whole mortal race, and you have entrusted this power for no other purpose than that all might be made safe, be freed from death, and attain eternal life. For it has pleased you to bestow through the Son all that you bestow on human beings; through his death you give to all, if they wish it, eternal life.

'This, then, is the source of eternal life, that in the glorification of each of us by the other, through faith they come to know us both; that is, you, who alone are the true God not only of the Jews but of all the nations of the world,[5] the one from whom comes every good thing everywhere; and him whom you sent into the world for the salvation of the human race, Jesus Christ, through whom you give to humans all that your goodness has chosen to give. And so they should be grateful to both of us, to you as the supreme creator of all things, and to me who willingly and gladly am carrying out this task in accordance with your will. For one who honours the Father but scorns the Son, or who reveres the Son and disregards the Father, cannot obtain salvation, since the same glory belongs to us both.[6]

'All this time I have made your name glorious on earth by my miracles and my teaching; all this time, ready and willing for what remains, I have performed what you had commanded.[7] I have not sought my glory but yours; indeed, I have cast myself down to the utmost lowliness of shame in order to make the glory of your name bright among humankind. For your glory in itself is never-changing, and you are not in need of glory among humans, but their need is for you to become known to them.[8] And now, my Father, in your turn, make the world understand that I have been completely returned to the glory that I had with you before this world was created. Because of the frailty of the body people still think little of me, but they think grandly of you. As your glory of itself has no beginning and no ending, so it also knows neither increase nor decrease. And the frailty of the body I have taken on has not diminished my glory, which I have always had, being always your Son; rather, you created the world through me so that there might be those who would learn, marvel at, and love your power, your wisdom, and your goodness. Now it is again time for your goodness to restore creation through me. And it will be restored if the world learns how great your love for the human race is, when for the sake of its salvation you hand your only Son over to death; if it learns how great your power is, when you break the tyranny of the devil; if it learns how great your wisdom is, when by such a marvellous plan you turn to you a world separated from you.

'The foundations of this deed are laid.[9] I have made your name known to those whom you have removed from the world by your inspiration and handed over to me. For they could not be removed from this world, they could not be engrafted in me, unless your freely given goodness had inspired their hearts. Those whom you had created were yours; those whom you had marked out for this task were yours; and you handed them over to me to be taught and shaped.[10] Your kindness to them was not in vain, and my work was not in vain. They have believed in my teaching, in which you were my subject, and they not only believed but have been all this time steadfast in their belief, obedient to my words. For they are certain and convinced of this (which the Jews refused to believe), that whatever I taught, whatever I did, came from you as its source and was done by your power. And I handed on to them nothing other than what I had received from you to be handed on, for whatever I am, I am from you, and nothing is yours that is not also mine. And so these have received my words, which the Pharisees scorned, as coming from you, and believing in my words they truly know that I have come from you, that I came into this world sent by you. They have progressed to this point, that they are convinced I am the messiah, awaited for so many generations, whom you have sent into the world for the salvation of all believers.[11]

'Now since as regards our physical association I am leaving them, I entrust them in turn to your goodness, so they do not go backward but always forward for the better. They know to whom they must credit their salvation. They know on whose protection they must rely. They depend on you. So I ask on their behalf, since you have chosen them to be taken from the world and to be yours, that your goodness grant that what was begun in them be their permanent possession. I do not ask now on the world's behalf, which, blinded by evil desires,[12] stubbornly decries my teaching, looking suspiciously upon the salvation freely offered it. I ask on behalf of those whom you handed over to me to be saved, because they do not belong to this world but to you, and they cannot be safe against the evildoing of the devil except by your ceaseless protection. So I entrust to you, Father, your own, that you may grant them to be unceasingly your own as I am unceasingly your own. And they are mine by virtue of being yours, because all things are shared between us. For whatever is mine is yours also; whatever is yours is also mine. What is more, as you have been glorified among humankind by my teaching, so I have been glorified[13] through the belief of these who have clung steadfastly to me though the scribes and Pharisees stubbornly decry me. For in a certain fashion these will take my place, and when I have been raised from the earth they will make the name of us both[14] celebrated throughout the world. I have completed the task of my preaching, to which they will succeed.

'And hereafter I am not in the world, which I am soon leaving. But they remain in the world for now, in my place, to spread throughout all the nations of the earth what they have learned from me. Leaving them behind I come entirely to you. Holy Father, preserve in the preaching of your name those whom you gave to me to be taught, that they may teach what you wanted me to teach and what I in complete obedience to your will have taught; so that as I have never departed from your instructions but have shown myself in all things assenting to your will, so too the teaching and the life of my followers may never dissent from mine. In this way our name will be truly glorified through them, if, as you and I, in assenting to each other, each glorify the other, so these too, never dissenting from us, make our name glorious in the whole world. For whatever they teach, whatever they do, since it will be understood to have come from us, will be credited to the glory of our name.

'As long as I have lived with them in physical comradeship, I have tried, even by services to their physical needs, to preserve them as yours and as entrusted to me by you, and all this time I have kept them in our bond. I have faithfully guarded as many as you handed over to me, and none of this fellowship has been lost except one, who though he lived with me was not mine, but was born for perdition,[15] which he himself by his own fault called down upon himself.[16] For I have omitted nothing that could have recalled him to a better purpose. Even this did not happen by chance; divine Scripture had already long ago foretold that a friend and member of my household would be bribed and would betray his Lord and master to death.[17] But by your holy purpose even the destruction of this man advances the general salvation of the world, while through him the thing without which salvation cannot occur is brought about, and an example is provided to remind everyone to stand fast in what he has begun, so that he does not by his own fault turn to eternal damnation what has been offered by God's freely given goodness for the attainment of eternal salvation.

'But just as now these things have been completed by your eternal purpose in the way that you have chosen, so I, having carried out what you commanded, am leaving the world and coming to you. I say this to you before I depart not because I have any doubt about your will, but so that in these words I may console and strengthen my followers.[18] I want them to understand that they will be in your care once they have been bereft of the sight of my body, and to put aside their grief, inasmuch as they understand that I shall live again. I want them to rejoice in a little while, when they see me resurrected; and finally, when they see me raised into heaven and they receive the heavenly Spirit, the deputy of both you and me, I want them to experience not the passing joy that is produced from the sight of my restored body but a complete and continual joy that our Spirit will always supply to them, dwelling in their hearts, so that then they will depend on nothing else than trust in us and knowledge of the right.

'The world will stir up great storms of persecutions against them because my teaching is not congruent with the lusts of this world. In fact people crave for earthly and transitory objects; I teach divine things. The teaching that you handed over to me I have handed on to them, and though the world despised it these few embraced it. For that reason the world persecutes them in hatred, as being runaways from it and deserters to us – for no other reason than that they renounce the world and cling to us. This world has its charms, enticing for a while; it has its alarms and threats, with which it breaks even the brave heart. So it protects its partisans, and attacks ours. It is right, then, and proper to our kindness, that those who have defected from the world's party to us and have entrusted themselves entirely to us and depend entirely on us should be in your care. In this way the world will understand that those who put themselves under our protection are safer than those who rely on the world's assistance. Their simple trust in us earns the favour of heaven, and the world's hatred of them, which has arisen for our sake, calls forth our good will towards them. The world does not hate them because it thinks they are thieves or murderers or burglars or impostors, but because it sees them exempt from the faults of this world, from self-seeking, greed, envy, and the deceitfulness of the Pharisees, from idolatry, immorality, and the other faults under which the world in general labours. In short, the world hates them because, spurning the teaching of the Pharisees and the foolish philosophy of the world, in simple faith they obey my commandments, just as the world hates me too because it sees me obeying your will. And the world does not merely hate me; it will hate my name and memory as well, and on my account it will persecute in hatred anyone who scorns human dogmas and follows the pure and simple gospel teaching, because he is in profound disagreement with the lusts of those who embrace the things of this world with all their energies.

'Now, having completed my task, I am being separated from the world's fellowship, for so it is best. But I would not want these to be my companions yet; it is not yet time for them to be removed from the world, until they too complete the task appointed them.[19] I ask only this, that while they live in the world, they not be stained by the world's faults and then in defection from us be swept back among the world's partisans. For without your protection, they will not be able to avoid it, since they will be under fire from so many assaults. They cling fast to me, they are my branches, my limbs. So it is that as I am a stranger to the world because I cling to you, they also are strangers to the world because they cling to me.[20] As I have kept myself pure from the world's filth, keep them pure from every stain of the world. That will happen if with your protection they are steadfast in the truth. The wisdom of the world has a great quantity of falsehood mixed with it. The law of Moses is veiled in the shadows of physical reality. But your word, which I have taught, is pure truth; it has no false colours, it has no shadowy mists.[21] I have handed it on purely and simply, so that now there is no need for the many interpretations, the Pharisees' many regulations, the philosophers' many elaborate sophisms. My teaching alone, simple and accessible to all provided there is a willingness to believe, will be enough for eternal bliss. As I, your apostle,[22] sent by you into the world, have faithfully carried out your business, in no way defiled by the world's stain but instead drawing the world to my purity, so I send these too into the world in my place, so that what they received from me they may teach purely and simply, not desirous of their own profit or glory but of your will; and I do it so that through their witness great numbers may be drawn to us and separated from the world, which is entirely given to sin. For this reason I sacrifice myself as an offering to you,[23] that these too, cleansed from sin, may be pure and steadfast in preaching the gospel truth. For it is not possible for one who is in bondage to worldly passions to preach my teaching to the world with purity.

'And I do not ask for the sake of these alone, who are few, but for all who, through my teaching as preached by them, will renounce the world and put all their trust in me. For as I, in clinging to your words, am not torn away from you; as these, in clinging to my teaching, will not be torn away from me but like branches will live in us and like limbs will be given life by our Spirit; in the same way others also, who cling to the words of my followers, words which they received from me and will hand on to the world, will be engrafted in me and joined through me to you. And so the entire interconnected body will form a whole, you the root, I the stock, the Spirit spread through all the limbs, these and the ones who will believe through them the branches, extending far and wide throughout the whole world.[24]

'I can do nothing without you; these will be able to do nothing without me. What I received from you I pour into them through the Spirit that all share, so that as you assert your power in me and I cling unsundered to you, so we may also assert our power in them clinging unsundered to us; and hence the world, moved by their unanimity of teaching,[25] by their miracles, by their chaste behaviour, may believe that I came from you, and whatever I did through you may redound to the glory of your name; so that the world may understand that our Spirit is in these too, the Spirit that asserts its power in miracles and many other kinds of proofs. For I did not claim for myself the glory that the miracles I did among mortals brought me, but I ascribed it, Father, to you, whom I always proclaimed as my authority. In the same way, since they will do nothing in their own name but will attribute everything to the glory of our name, the glory that they will get for themselves in the future by their remarkable deeds will be entirely ours. And so the world will understand that the unanimity between them and me is like that between me and you.

'Through my Spirit I shall act in them, as you have asserted your truth in me; hence they too, like the limbs of one body, holding fast to one head and quickened by one Spirit,[26] will cling fast to each other in mutual unanimity, so that on every side the unanimity will be absolute and perfect, in heaven and on earth. Conflict of opinions deprives teaching of its trustworthiness. If in unanimity they teach what I have taught, if their life corresponds to their teaching, then the world will surely understand that the teaching is not human but has come from me, whom you sent into the world. It will understand that they too are dear to you, obedient to your will, as I am dear to you, never swerving from your purpose. Father, it is my desire that as these whom you have taken from the world and given to me will be imitators of my suffering and my cross, so they may also be sharers in my glory; as they have been observers of my lowliness and witnesses of my punishment, so they may be also observers of the glory that you are going to give me when I have finished with these ills. I want them to learn themselves to aim at everlasting joys through suffering and to set out on the way to undying glory through shame. For the glory that you are going to give me is not new, and the love with which you love me is not new, but you are displaying the proofs of your love for me among mortals so that those who want to be mine may by a route like mine strive for heavenly glory. Those whom you will honour with your love and your glory have been beloved by you since before the creation of the world.

'Righteous Father, I have left nothing undone by which you might become known to all; but the world, in large measure blinded by its own faults, has refused to acknowledge you, because it has refused to believe in me when I teach about you. In true purity from the world I know you, and I have preached you as I know you. And my preaching has not been entirely in vain. Through me these followers, the ones you had chosen for this, know you, that is, that I came from you, although the Pharisees make a great outcry about my having come from Beelzebub the prince of demons.[27] But as your goodness sent me to save everyone if possible, so your righteousness will not allow the prayers of the believers to be proved in vain because of the unbelief of a few. The learned, the powerful, the religious leaders have rejected your teaching, but these ignorant, humble, uneducated people have through me received knowledge of your name,[28] and I shall make it more and more known to them, so that in the surpassing love in which you have enfolded me you may enfold them too, and so that they in turn, more fully taught through my Spirit,[29] may love us in return, and cherish and protect each other in mutual kindliness. For in this way they will be invincible against all the tumults of this world.'

Chapter 18

Our Lord Jesus strengthened and encouraged the hearts of his followers with such words, and entrusted his flock to his Father. Then, in order to make it quite clear to his disciples that he was willingly and freely enduring what he endured, of his own free will he went to meet those who were going to take him prisoner.[1] For it was the dead of night, and unless he were caught in a familiar spot, he could not be taken. So he left the place where he said all this to his disciples, and crossing the stream whose name in Hebrew means Cedarbrook, from its nature,[2] he went in company with the disciples to a garden, well aware that Judas would come there with an armed troop of guards. For Judas, his betrayer, knew quite well that Jesus made a practice of often going there late at night with his disciples to pray. Night-time was chosen for this so the people would not raise an uproar, and an armed band was used so that Jesus' companions would not prevent his being taken prisoner.[3]

So Judas was changed from Jesus' disciple into his betrayer and from the companion of his redeemer into a robber chief. With the troop that he had gotten from the priests and Pharisees,[4] into whose hands he had agreed to surrender Jesus, he came into the garden where the Lord had entered with his disciples and was praying. And they brought with them torches and lanterns, so he could be recognized in the darkness,[5] and also swords and clubs against the disciples' might, in case anyone tried to defend his Lord. But nothing of what was happening escaped Jesus' notice, and wanting to teach clearly that what he was enduring he endured knowingly and willingly, without waiting for their approach he went forward to meet them as they came up. He himself asked whom they wanted, lest by mistake they lay hands on one of the disciples. And when they replied that they wanted Jesus of Nazareth, he answered in a steady voice, 'I am the one you want.' Now Judas Iscariot, who a minute before had betrayed Jesus with the sign of a traitor's kiss,[6] was there with the troop as the Lord gave this answer, but the Lord neither betrayed the one who betrayed him nor spoke angrily to the hired troop of soldiers, so that to the very last he offered his disciples a model of mildness.

But at this statement of Jesus', 'I am the one,' the terrified troop was thrust backwards and fell to the ground, unable to bear the might of the Lord's voice. When they recovered their spirits and again prepared to confront Jesus, the Lord asked them again whom they wanted. When they replied, as they had just before, that they wanted Jesus of Nazareth, he again answered in a steady voice, 'I have already told you that I am the one you want. But if you want me, I put myself alone in your power; let these people go away, since you have at present no claim against them on my account.' Now that Jesus had driven back the corrupt armed band of soldiers, together with the shameless traitor, one time[7] with just his voice, and thrown them to the ground, he said this to make clear by the plainest proof that he could not have been taken prisoner by any force unless he had allowed it.[8] Then, while he had made his own capture possible, he did not allow the same claim against his disciples, because he had foretold that at that time the storm would rage over his own head only, and that the others would be discouraged, certainly, but safe till he came to them again; and thus he offered a model of the good shepherd who purchases the safety of his flock at the cost of his own life.[9]

Now Simon Peter burned[10] with special love for his Lord, since he had made some grand promises about himself, saying that he would purchase his Lord's life at the cost of his own.[11] When he saw the armed troop lay hands on Jesus, he forgot what the Lord had told him. Suddenly hot with rage[12] he drew his sword, and without waiting for the Lord's command struck at a slave of the high priest, whose name was Malchus. But the blow was thwarted and only cut off his right ear, for the Lord surely was guiding

Peter's hand so that the wound would be minor.[13] Even so he in his gentleness soon made the loss good.[14] But the Lord allowed the future head of his church to fall into this error, out of a passion that was holy, it is true, so that he might more surely and effectively strip away for the future all lust for vengeance,[15] and completely banish the right of arms, once he had also rebuked the one who, not yet having received the prohibition, had out of his holy passion prepared to defend his holy Lord against unholy men.[16] And so by his divine power Jesus did indeed curb the violence of the soldiers against Peter, but he also rebuked the disciple, who by now was ablaze for more of the fight. He said, 'Peter, what are you doing? Have you forgotten that earlier, when you were urging me away from my death, you heard yourself called Satan and were ordered to get behind me?[17] To what end is your sword drawn? To obstruct my death, which I undergo willingly and on my Father's authority? You ought properly to imitate my cross, not ward it off. So sheathe your blade. The business of the gospel is not carried on with such defences. If you wish to succeed to my place, you must fight with no other sword than that of the word of the gospel,[18] which shears off sins and saves mortals. Am I not to drink this cup of death that the Father has given me to drink? How shall we all become one, as I asked the Father a while ago,[19] unless you heed my commandments in the same way that I obey my Father's will even to death?'

These words barred the disciples from fighting. The troop of soldiers and their officer, together with the servants supplied by the priests and Pharisees, laid their sinful hands on Jesus, and binding him like a criminal, they took him first to the priest Annas, the father-in-law of Caiaphas, and from there he was sent to Caiaphas himself. Now Caiaphas was the high priest of that year. So they took Jesus from Annas' house to Caiaphas, of whom mention was made earlier,[20] because when the others were in doubt about what was to be done about Jesus, he, inspired by the prophetic spirit because of the office he held, had urged that Jesus should be completely taken up from among them, since it was for the common good that the welfare of the whole people be secured by the death of one man. So Jesus was conducted first to this man's father-in-law[21] so that they could feast their eyes on the longed-for sight of him and he could be questioned in the man's house to see whether they could find in him any pretext for a charge. For though they had murderous intentions, still, because of their fear of the people and the governor, they were eager to allege some pretext of justice. But God's providence turned the sinful cunning of humans to the glory of his Son. For while he was taken prisoner in this way and brought from Annas to Caiaphas, from Caiaphas to Pilate, from Pilate to Herod, from Herod back to Pilate;[22] while he was questioned by many people and accused on many grounds, he made everyone witnesses and confessors of his innocence, even his enemies. Now there is no more certain evidence of innocence than what the truth wrings out of an enemy.[23] But indeed how they gave evidence of a high priest's impartiality! They secured the betrayal of an innocent man with a bribe, with a hired band of armed men they captured one unarmed man who did not fight back but who only gave a sample of his power, had he chosen to use it; they shackled a man who voluntarily offered himself to them; they took him not to his judge but to his enemy, as if they were showing off a war-prize;[24] and there at last they sought for a charge to make, though the impartiality even of gentile laws lays hands on no one unless a serious suspicion of wrongdoing attaches to him first.

So then, while Jesus was being taken there, that is, to Caiaphas,[25] Simon Peter, still feeling some confidence in his own power though forbidden to fight, followed Jesus along with another disciple, the one who a little while earlier had rested on Jesus' breast at dinner.[26] This man was known to the high priest, and relying on the acquaintance he dared to go in with Jesus as far as the high priest's courtyard. But since Peter was not known he did not dare to follow inside, but stopped outside near the door – at this point falling far short of that brave statement 'I will lay down my life for you';[27] and yet something of manly courage still remained. For it was owing to his love that he dared to follow as far as the door when the others had hurried off in every direction. On the other hand, that he did not dare to enter was owing to fear, and it was the prelude to the denial soon to follow.[28] But the other disciple, seeing that Peter was not following him, told the maidservant who was the doorkeeper to bring in the man standing at the door. And when she did so, the woman looked at Peter and vaguely recognized him, because she had occasionally seen him in Jesus' company and especially since she had been told to bring him in by a man she knew was Jesus' disciple. She said, 'Aren't you also a disciple of that man who was just led in a prisoner?' At this remark from an insignificant woman, who displayed no hostility nor presented any cause for alarm since she was associating Peter with a man she was not attacking, since she knew he was Jesus' disciple, and since she spoke of the man Jesus in a way that suggested she took pity on him rather than being outraged,[29] Peter instantly forgot all that Jesus had impressed on him in their many conversations, forgot his grand promise, and said that he was not Jesus' disciple. This surely is the first assertion of those who wish to attach themselves to the courts of princes: to deny Christ, that is, to deny the truth.[30] Having entered in this way, Peter mingled with the attendants and slaves of the high priest who were standing at a brazier and warming themselves against the chill of the late hour. He warmed himself along with them, hoping thus to escape notice,[31] and meanwhile awaiting the outcome of the procedure against Jesus. For he had not yet cast off all hope that death could be avoided, but he was so dazed with fear that he had no memory of what the Lord had foretold a little while earlier, that that brave maker of promises would deny his Lord on oath.

Caiaphas,[32] therefore, the high priest, wanting to present some appearance of a legitimate trial but really seeking to glean from Jesus' various answers something that could be pinned on him by way of a charge,[33] asked Jesus many questions about his disciples – what kind of people they were, where he had gotten them, for what purpose he was gathering them, and what he had taught them secretly. But Jesus knew that he was not asking in the spirit of an impartial judge in order to find out the truth, but was deceitfully hunting for a charge he could bring, even by seeking a handle[34] for a charge at this point against the disciples, whom Jesus wanted to be unharmed for now. He made no reply to the high priest's loaded questions, but referred him away from the evidence of himself and his followers to the evidence of people in general and even of his enemies – and nothing can be more trustworthy for an innocent person than his enemies' evidence.[35] 'Why do you ask me,' he said, 'what I have taught my followers in secret? My teaching was neither revolutionary nor clandestine. I have spoken openly to the world. I have always taught what I taught in your synagogues and in the temple on the holy days, a very well-known time and place when the Jews come together from all parts of Syria. What is more, I have said nothing in secret that I have not also dared to teach publicly. Many a time have the people listened to me, and many a time the Pharisees. Why do you now question me as if about a stealthy and clandestine teaching? Why not ask those who heard me teaching publicly? Evidence from those who have not been linked with me in friendship, and many of whom even hate me, will be more trustworthy. Let them, even my enemies, report what I have taught. Most people know it, and it will not be hard to find witnesses of my teaching.'

When Jesus had said this, incidentally demonstrating that on behalf of truth one must indeed sometimes speak forcefully, but without insulting language, one of the high priest's attendants who happened to be standing just there, a man not unlike his master, wanted to defend the honour of his high priest against Jesus' outspokenness, just as Peter wanted to defend his teacher's safety against the might of the soldiers.[36] Without waiting for his master's order, he slapped Jesus' face, adding an insult worthy of both the high priest and his own slavish self: 'Is that the way you answer the high priest?' Our Lord Jesus could have both destroyed the sinful high priest and restrained the striker of the blow, if he had not chosen to give his followers an example of how absurd and distorted are the courtrooms of the world.[37] For one observer of this was Peter, who could not endure the remark of an insignificant maidservant, though our Lord was struck by a slave. Then the Lord Jesus, who behaved very mildly in the face of all injustices but was never sterner than with those who in the name and garb of religion attacked true religion, did not take the slap in silence, though he endured the cross in silence. The high priest was presiding; Jesus was being questioned in chains; and there was every appearance of a trial. Even before a gentile judge, the accused is heard and questioned in turn. Before the high priest a slap instead of an answer was given, and given to him who was going to be the judge of the living and the dead.[38] And so Jesus answered, in a forthright fashion, true, but quite mildly, 'I am speaking before a judge; I answer him when I am asked. In this situation even among the gentiles one proceeds by reasons, not by slaps. If I said something improper, instruct me; but if I have said nothing improper, why am I struck by the judge's servant, in the judge's court, while the judge says nothing, and without explanation of my error?'

They were doing this in the house of Caiaphas the high priest, to whom, as I said, Annas his father-in-law had sent Jesus in chains.[39] But in the mean time, while this was going on as Peter watched at a little distance (for he, as I had started to say,[40] was standing in the crowd of attendants and warming himself at the brazier), there were some among them who recognized Peter in one way or another from various signs and said to him, 'Aren't you too one of the disciples of the man who is being treated in this way by the high priest?' After seeing such a monstrous sight Peter was even more frightened and again said that he was not Jesus' disciple. For now he realized from the high priest's questioning that they were also thinking about arresting the disciples. Peter thought that by this denial he would be free from danger, in the same way that he had disentangled himself from the maidservant at the door. But so that he would more fully acknowledge how he could do nothing by his own power when he was separated from the fellowship of his Lord,[41] there stood among the rest of the crowd of attendants a blood relative of the man who a little while earlier in the garden had been struck by Peter and lost an ear, when, bolder than the rest, he had been the first to try to lay hands on Jesus. This man had been provided by divine providence to avenge the wrong done his relative, but actually to correct Peter's rash self-confidence. For he was not content with Peter's one denial, since the fight, even though it took place in the dark, had made Peter easy to recognize. He said, 'Why do you say that you are not one of his disciples? Didn't I just see you with my own eyes in the garden with Jesus?' Thoroughly panic-stricken at this remark, Peter said he was damned if he knew the man. And at that moment the cock crowed. Yet Peter did not come to himself at this sign, which the Lord had foretold to him, and he would not have come to himself at all if the Lord with his powerful gaze had not brought him back to himself and by wordless inspiration called forth the tears of penitence.[42] In so many ways did he have to be taught, this future prince of the church, in all things to distrust himself and to depend on the protection of his Lord alone.

So when Jesus had been questioned before Caiaphas all night long until dawn and no crime had been found in him for which he could be arraigned on a capital charge, they took him from the house of Caiaphas the high priest to Pilate the governor, in order to divert the onus of innocent blood onto Pilate. And Jesus indeed, bound as he was, was taken by the hired troop into the governor's headquarters. But the Jews themselves did not go into the headquarters so that they would not be defiled, because they had to eat the paschal lamb, the eating of which they wanted to approach in a state of ritual purity; their religion was truly distorted since they believed that they would be profaned by the harmless residence of the governor because he was not a Jew, while they themselves were with all their skill devising death for a man who had done nothing wrong, indeed who had in so many ways done right.[43]

So when Pilate saw the new type of trial, the man taken prisoner and bound before he had been heard by a judge, and the armed band of men,[44] he came outside, himself about to be defiled by conversation with those who now thought they were pure. But he came out to calm, if possible, the raving of the Jews and to set an innocent man free. He said, 'You are sending me this man to suffer capital punishment. But it is not the Roman custom to punish anyone unless he has been convicted on a capital charge.[45] What charge, then, do you bring against him?' The Jews answered, 'The authority of the priests and Pharisees should be sufficient for you. If he were not a wrongdoer, we would not have delivered him into your hands, for that is our religion.' Suspecting what was in fact the case, that there was some private hatred here because of the superstitious regard for the law,[46] Pilate said, 'If there is something that does not have to do with my court, such as breaking the sabbath or eating pork or presumptuous remarks against your Moses, or prophets, or temple, or God, or if anything similar has been done that your law orders punished though it is not otherwise forbidden by the Roman law, then take the man off by yourselves and try him according to your own law. I serve as governor in the name of Caesar. If anything deserving of capital punishment has been done in violation of Caesar's law, bring your charge, and when he has been lawfully found guilty I will administer punishment. Beyond that I do not meddle in questions of your law.'[47] But though the Jews wished Jesus dead by any means, they pleaded their religion as an excuse, fearful that they would pay the penalty to the judge for killing an innocent man without a trial; and at the same time they were aiming at a new type of punishment, which was at that time among the Jews the most disgraceful of all.[48] 'It is forbidden for us to kill anyone,' they said. So said the shameless race that had killed so many prophets, flattering itself, as if it were exempt from murder, when in so many ways it was driving an innocent man to the slaughter, or as if the only murderer is the executioner who with his own hands nails him to the cross. They had a murdering purpose, they had murdering tongues; they had hired the traitor, hired the armed troop, hired the false witnesses, invented the false charges; they were pressuring and terrorizing the judge. And they thought they were unsullied by murder, and worthy to eat the paschal lamb, for no other reason than that they had refrained from entering the Roman headquarters![49] But all this was done so that it would be clearly evident that nothing is more criminal than distorted religion; and also so that Jesus' prophecy (when, indicating in a riddle what death he would die, he said, 'When I am raised on high from the earth, I will draw all things to me') would come to pass, and then we might understand entirely that he had not only determined to die but had chosen the method of death.[50]

So after Pilate had heard what the Jews were saying and understood that among other things some accusation about aspiring to a kingdom was being made against Jesus, while there was nothing to be seen in Jesus' appearance to produce credence in this charge, he went back into the headquarters, leaving the crowd outside, and summoned Jesus to him privately, so that away from the uproar[51] he could fish out the facts from a man who, as far as could be seen from his demeanour, was honest and sensible. He said, 'Are you that king of the Jews for whom they are supposed to be waiting?' Pilate carefully investigated this one point because while the other things did not have to do with the state, this charge did seem to concern both the sovereignty of Caesar and the public peace.[52] Yet he investigated the charge not because he believed it but so that something might be supplied by the accused with which he could refute the Jews.[53] Now though Jesus was well aware that the Jews had given false information to the effect that as a deliberate affront to Caesar he was aspiring to a kingdom, he still wanted to lay bare the Jews' wickedness and support Pilate's impartiality, far better than that of the priests and Pharisees, gentile though he was and a despiser of the Jewish religion.[54] So he answered, 'Do you draw this conclusion on your own, that I am aspiring to a kingdom, or have the Jews given you information against me to this effect?'

Revealing his own innocence and the wickedness of the Jews, Pilate said, 'By no means do I draw this conclusion on my own, and I see nothing in you that fits such a charge. That tale about a king who is to come belongs to the Jews. Surely you don't think that I am a Jew. Your own slandering people and your priests have handed you over to me, making every effort to have you killed. But since it is not the Roman custom to kill a man without a trial, then if the charge of aspiring to a kingdom is false, what have you done wrong?' Since Pilate was honestly asking this so that he could set an innocent man free, Jesus thought it fitting to answer him in a riddle, teaching that it is another kind of kingdom about which the prophets had spoken, far loftier than this worldly kingdom which is formed by human laws and human resources and has power only over bodies; that it is a heavenly kingdom, which does not seek the kingdom of the world but scorns it, and does not harm the kingdom of the world but betters it. He said, 'My kingdom is not the kind that Caesar's is. His is earthly but mine is heavenly. So I aspire to nothing that could harm the sovereignty of Caesar. If my kingdom were of this world, the world would not be doing these things against me without punishment, for I too, like other kings, would certainly have an armed retinue, I would have armed attendants[55] and bodyguards; I would have troops at the ready; these defenders would fight battles on my behalf, so that what the Jews are scheming against me would not be allowed to go unpunished. But in fact I have only a few disciples, unwarlike and of modest circumstances at that, and I am unarmed and unwarlike, clearly relying on other defences exactly because my kingdom is not an earthly one.'

Since the gentile Pilate did not entirely understand this puzzling statement yet had heard that Jesus did not directly deny the name of king but was distinguishing types of kingship, he said, 'Then it is true that you are a king somewhere, whatever type of kingdom it may be that does not have to do with us?'[56] At this Jesus, on being seriously asked by the judge whether he was in some way a king, unassumingly declared what was the truth: 'You say I am a king.' For anyone who asks a question makes an affirmation in the same words, only changing the emphasis. 'For it is not for me to deny what is true, especially when this is what I was born for and why I came into the world: not to deceive with a lie but to bear witness to the truth. Anyone whose heart is simple and not blinded by the lusts of this world recognizes and heeds my voice.'

But Pilate did not understand what was said, except that he judged that the matter had nothing to do with his jurisdiction, and in any case Christ would not give a suitable answer with which he could either calm or fend off the Jews. So when he had asked what the truth was of which Jesus spoke and in witness of which he had come into the world, without waiting for the prisoner's answer,[57] he again went outside to the Jews. 'There is no need for a long speech,' he said; 'I have examined the man and I find no crime in him deserving of capital punishment. And I do not serve as governor here in Caesar's name so that innocent people can be found guilty by a decision of mine. Furthermore, even if he is guilty in your eyes, which I do not find, it is nonetheless right, if you refuse to spare him on grounds of his innocence, to grant him his life anyway, though he may be guilty, out of regard for your holy day. Now there is the custom among you that on this festival of Passover, which you keep as holiest of all, I am to pardon some one of the guilty at your request. So it will be yours to choose one of the two, Barrabas[58] the well-known robber and disrupter of the public peace, or this Jesus, in my judgment an innocent man, who some say is the king of the Jews. For it is better, even if this man has done some wrong, for him to experience the good will of your celebration. Are you willing, then, for me to give him to you?' For the governor did not expect that the raving of the Jews was so great that they would prefer a professed criminal and brigand of notorious boldness to the mild and innocent Jesus. But as with one voice the Jews all cried out, 'He's not the one we want given to us, but Barrabas.'

Chapter 19

The governor had tried everything; leaving no stone unturned[1] in his attempt either to disentangle himself from the accused or to declare him innocent, he had even sent Jesus to Herod[2] as a possible way out of his difficulties. But when he saw that he was making no headway with the raging crowd of Jews towards softening their madness and removing an innocent man from the death penalty,[3] he ordered Jesus to be beaten with canes in the usual Roman way. Then the soldiers in the courtyard, most of whom the Jews had hired to administer their savagery, from their own inventiveness added considerable cruelty to the customary punishment.[4] For to mock him after his beating they dressed him in a purple cloak and put a crown plaited of thorns on his head, placing a reed in his hand for a sceptre. Next, as if reviling the lowly and despised man for aspiring to a kingdom, they would come up to him and kneel and say, 'Hail, King of the Jews.' Why, they even spat in his face and slapped him,[5] while in response to every sort of mockery the Lord of all the universe behaved very meekly, in order to teach us, who though we are nothing still have haughty and insolent hearts, gentleness and endurance in hardships.[6] Now Pilate permitted this to happen to Jesus to soothe the Jews' hatred through the man's suffering.[7] For if the people's rage has run wild for a time against the person who is its object, it usually subsides in a hurry, especially if mockery added to his misfortune makes the once hated sufferer pitiable. And so the governor went outside again to see whether he could soften the crowd's savagery. 'Look,' he said, 'I am bringing the man out here to you so you can feast your eyes on the sight of him and understand how he has been treated to please you, though I find no fault in him.' So at Pilate's order Jesus came forward, decked out as he was, bound, beaten, spat upon, wearing the crown of thorns and the purple garment; and showing him to the crowd Pilate said, 'Look, here is the man.'

But at this sight, at which any extreme of barbarian wildness could have softened, the hearts of the Jews not only were not soothed but were kindled even more to carry through what had gone this far.[8] For the priests feared that if Jesus were set free after undergoing such abuse, once the excitement of the people, who were already aroused, had been redirected, the onus of this monstrous act would fall on the priests' own heads.[9] So they and their servants shouted out in a frenzied din, 'Crucify him, crucify him!' Realizing that there was no hope of appealing to their pity, Pilate tried to curb their rage by fear. 'I administer justice,' he said; 'I am not an avenger for other people's hate, and I punish the guilty by authority of the laws; I am not an executioner of the innocent. Your hatred has been obliged this far; I will not commit violence against a guiltless man any further. If you are determined to force him to the cross I prefer not to have my headquarters desecrated with the blood of an innocent man. Take the man away at your own risk and if you think you should, crucify him. I do not make a practice of crucifying any but criminals. In this man I find no crime deserving of the cross. And as for the charge of aspiring to a kingdom, it does not suit a man like this. It is not enough to lay a charge against a prisoner unless what is charged is proved by definite evidence, especially when it is a capital case. This whole business is being done not by the rule of law but by crowd pressure.'[10] Since the Jews heard Pilate defending Jesus so warmly and since they thought that they must certainly not let Jesus somehow slip out of their hands, they made up the kind of charge that could seem serious to a judge who was not learned in the law. They said, 'Though he has done nothing against Caesar's laws, we have a law given to us by God which even Caesar leaves to us. According to this law, he has earned the death penalty because he has made himself out to be the Son of God, and by claiming divinity for himself, has been a blasphemer against God.'

On hearing this, and having no answer ready for them,[11] Pilate had Jesus taken back into the headquarters, and going in himself he spoke with him again, wanting to fish out what it was they were alleging against him and how it could be refuted. So first he asked where Jesus was from, so that when he knew his family origin he could disprove that Jesus had aspired to be thought the Son of God, though among the gentiles at that time it had been put forward in poets' stories, and was widely believed, that certain persons born of a god and a mortal were considered demigods.[12] But Jesus knew that Pilate was trying all this in order in the end to save his life for him, and was well aware that when he had tried everything he would yield to the stubborn madness of the Jews; so, to avoid seeming driven to death unwillingly and only after making every attempt to escape, he made no answer at all to the governor.[13] As for the answers he had made so far, he wanted his innocence to be attested to; but he had determined to meet death willingly and freely. Wondering at the silence of a man in peril of his life when he had such a favourable judge, Pilate tried to provoke him to answer. 'Why don't you answer me,' he said, 'when you are placed in peril of your life? Don't you know that I have the right of life and death over you? For I am the governor of this province, in case you don't know it, and whether you are nailed to a cross or freed from the charge depends on my will.'

To this Jesus did not make any of the answers expected by the governor, who wanted to be instructed for the defence of his case, intending to be his advocate instead of his judge. But since a defence would have looked as if he were not suffering willingly, he made no reply of this sort but only about the power that Pilate was claiming for himself, implying that he was not free to declare Jesus innocent, since his power was compelled to comply with the Jews' madness,[14] and furthermore that neither Pilate nor they would be able to do anything against him unless Jesus himself freely and willingly allowed it.[15] He said, 'Yes, you have the power according to human laws, but you would have no power over me if it were not granted by him whose power surpasses every human power. And yes, you do support innocence, but the wickedness of other people overwhelms you and hurries you off in other directions. Because the Jewish people,[16] the cause of this execution, and their violence compel a judge to the condemnation of an innocent man, their sin is the greater.' When on hearing this Pilate understood the composure and the innocence of the man, and that the malice of the Jews and his own impartiality were known to the accused (whom he favoured the more because he saw that he was not disturbed by peril of death), he tried every way to release Jesus somehow. The Jews, realizing that the governor was ignoring the previous charge levelled on the grounds of the law and that he continued to make every attempt to have Jesus set free, went back to their earlier charge and showed that ignoring it was not safe for the judge himself. 'If the sin he has committed against our God does not concern you,' they said, 'it certainly does concern you that he has sinned against Caesar. Anyone who claims a kingdom for himself without Caesar's bidding offends against Caesar's sovereignty. And this fellow makes himself out to be a king; if you set him free you are no friend of Caesar's, since you support Caesar's enemy.'

Pilate heard the conspiring priests and Pharisees and the rest of the crowd shouting out[17] these things; he was well aware that what they charged was completely without substance; yet he saw clearly the priests' and Pharisees' implacable hatred of Jesus and the astounding unanimity of leaders and people for the destruction of one man; and he also saw that Jesus was indeed guiltless but an insignificant person of humble circumstances and doing nothing on his own behalf; he also considered the fact that many had run into danger with the Caesars from the suspicion of a charge, even a false one;[18] and he now thought he had striven enough to protect the innocence of one insignificant man against an alliance of the entire nation, leaders and people. He decided to comply with their hatred, but in such a way as to declare Jesus innocent in condemning him, and, beginning with the statement of his own guiltlessness,[19] to put all the onus of the wicked deed on the heads of the Jews. So Jesus was led outside like a criminal, though in condemning him the appearance of no lawful trial had been maintained. Pilate sat on the tribunal on a raised place so that he was visible to everyone; the place was called Gabbatha in Hebrew from its height, but in Greek it is called Lithostrotos because it was paved with stone.[20] For it was fitting that Jesus' condemnation be done in the customary manner and publicly, so his innocence would escape no one. To be condemned in this fashion was to be declared innocent. Jesus was handed over to the cross, but judgment was given by the judge against the Jews.

And now the time was approaching for innocent blood[21] to be offered, according to the requirements of the festival, in sacrifice for the salvation of the world. For it was the Passover Parasceve [Preparation], around the sixth hour, and that is why the Jews, in ignorance complying with God's dispensation, were pressing more urgently for this sacrifice to be completed promptly and in good time. So Pilate, now visible to the people in his judge's dress, showed them the condemned man from the tribunal so that it would be clear from his very appearance how the charge of aspiring to tyranny did not fit one who under such an attack displayed so much tranquillity of spirit and so much meekness. 'Look,' he said, 'your king.' But the Jews, thirsting for nothing other than innocent blood, cried out, 'Away with him, away with him! Crucify him!' A shameful death is what the Jews wanted, in hopes that the shame of the cross would make the memory of Jesus accursed and that no one would later arise to proclaim the name of him who had been executed in such a way. Mocking their stubborn madness, Pilate said, 'What, am I so to shame your king as to nail him to a cross? This disgrace will fall to the shame of the nation that drove its king to the cross.'[22] Though this remark of Pilate's did Jesus no good, it still advertised the wickedness of the Jews and wrung a public declaration of their hateful slavery out of them. For many generations they had waited for their messiah, that is, the king promised by the prophets; they desperately hated the rule of Caesar, by which they were oppressed; but wild with hatred they publicly denied their messiah and acknowledged Caesar as their Lord.[23] 'We have no king,' they said,[24] 'but Caesar.' So great was their lust for vengeance that they voluntarily committed themselves to everlasting slavery in order to execute Jesus the author of their liberty.

So Pilate, seeing that everything he tried was useless, handed Jesus over to their control to be crucified. Now that Jesus was brought out of the headquarters, the Jews took him and led him to the place of execution, which was outside the city, so that the place also corresponded to the symbolic meaning. For the victim by which the covenant was sanctified was offered in sacrifice outside the boundaries of the people.[25] Jesus made his way there, now dressed in his own clothes, and himself humbly carrying his own cross so that he would be more embarrassing to all his supporters – for the Jews had seen to this too, so no shame would be missing. In fact even a dishonourable place was selected, where criminals customarily underwent their punishment, dismal and detestable, with the bones of the executed lying about, a place clearly demonstrating to what purpose it was dedicated, and from that it had gotten its common name, for in Hebrew it was called Golgotha, in Greek Kraniou topos, and in Latin, the Place of the Skull.[26] And so that no shame would be omitted, the Jews had also seen to it that two others, known criminals, would be crucified with Jesus; thus he would be considered an offender from association with criminals, and their guilt would seem shared because their punishment was shared.[27] And to make it appear to have something to do with their association, the Jews arranged the crosses so that Jesus was in the middle, flanked by thieves on both sides. But the source of all purity cannot be fouled by human filth; the source of all glory is even made bright by human infamy. The cross, once a sign of infamy, through him became a sign of triumph, at which the world bows its head, which angels adore and demons fear. There the condemned man found a thief of whom he made a citizen of paradise, so far was the shared punishment from staining him.[28]

But so that nothing would be missing from the appearance of a lawful punishment, each had an inscription added in the usual way, to identify the person and the charge.[29] Now when Pilate had provided the others with the inscription that each one's misdeeds required, he ordered this inscription attached to the cross of our Lord Jesus: 'Jesus of Nazareth, King of the

Jews' – so that of course by the very wording he gave witness to both the wickedness of the Jews and the innocence of the one hanging there, whom that inscription according to the Jews' accusation did not fit; and yet, according to what he himself had declared before the governor, it was exceedingly fitting. Indeed, 'Jew' in Hebrew means 'confessor.'[30] And he was and is truly king and liberator of all who profess his name, on whom he bestows a share in his heavenly kingdom. In order to put the onus of the deed even more on the priests and Pharisees, Pilate had this inscription written out in three languages, Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, the first of which was the language of that nation, while the other two, because of the regular traffic of Greeks and Romans, had spread to such a degree that quite a few Jews knew Greek and Latin also. Hence the governor took care that everyone, whether native or foreigner, would understand the inscription. Because of the crowds in the area (for Golgotha was close to the city and visible even to casual passersby) many of the Jews read this wording, odious to the Pharisees, and quite a few recognized the name of Jesus of Nazareth. But most knew how far he had been from aspiring to a kingdom, because they had seen him hide himself away when he was about to be dragged out to rule.[31] Now the king promised by the prophets, whom they called the messiah, was expected by the Jews as a whole. Though Pilate gave no thought to this, he unintentionally[32] gave the one inscription which would above all show to everyone who it was that hung there. For truly the king of kings hung there, who by his death was defeating the tyranny of the devil. One might call it a victory monument rather than a cross.[33] Although the whole affair seemed to the priests and Pharisees full of shame, this wording disturbed their hearts because it was more complimentary than they liked. So great was the eagerness of these ungodly men to remove the name to which alone all the glory of the whole world was owed. Hence they raised with the governor the question of changing the inscription so that not 'King of the Jews' but 'because he claimed this name for himself' would be written there. But the governor, however unintentionally, even then rehearsed the future when the proclamation of the salvific name, which the falsely named Jews denied, would move out to the believing nations, that is, to the true Jews.[34] So, having obliged their hatred in other matters thus far, he said he would not change the inscription: 'What I have written, I have written,' he said. It was indeed in everyone's interest for Christ to be killed, but it was also in everyone's interest for the glory of that name to be made famous in all the world, the name by proclamation of which salvation is offered to all.

So when with this inscription our Lord Jesus had been nailed naked to the cross, as was the custom, the soldiers who had crucified him divided Jesus' garments among themselves in the usual way, for this was allowed them as a bonus for their work.[35] Now because there were four of them, they took the clothing apart, sewn together as it was from a number of pieces, in such a way that each got his share. But the tunic was left, that is, the inner garment, the one closest to the body, and it was not pieced together but woven in one from top to bottom so that if it were taken apart it would be useless. So the soldiers decided that it should not be cut up but that the whole thing should go to the one chosen by lot. Although soldiers with godless hearts were doing this, even so they unintentionally complied with the prediction of the prophets, so that in this too he would be recognized as the one of whom the divine Spirit had foretold in the Psalms, 'They parted my clothing among them, and for my garment they cast lots.' And the soldiers did it while the Lord still hung alive.

But close to Jesus' cross stood Mary his mother, and clinging to her her sister Mary, the daughter of Clopas,[36] along with Mary Magdalene. When Jesus saw his mother from the cross, and also the disciple whom he loved more intimately than the others,[37] he wanted to leave behind on earth no human affection, just as now that his clothing was distributed he had left no possessions. So turning to his mother he said, 'Woman, look, your son,' indicating the disciple with a movement of his head and eyes. Then turning to the disciple, he said, 'Look, your mother.' And from that time the disciple had a son's affection for the mother of Jesus, taking care of her in all things.

After this, when Jesus knew that nothing was lacking that had to do with a lawful sacrifice, wanting to include what the prophecy had foretold ('They gave gall to be my food and for my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink' [Ps 69:21]), he called out from the cross, 'I thirst.' Now those who die by this type of execution as a rule are severely tormented by thirst, the blood of course having drained out through the wounds of the body.[38] To be sure, he did this also to make clear his human nature and the reality of an execution that was not feigned. Now there was a jar full of sour wine there, which was regularly offered to the thirsty to hasten death.[39] So the soldiers filled a sponge with sour wine, put it on a stalk of hyssop,[40] and held it up to his mouth. As soon as Jesus had tasted[41] the vinegar, he said, 'It is finished,' meaning that the sacrifice was properly completed, according to his Father's will; and soon, letting his head fall, he gave up the ghost.

And here it is worth while to hear again of the perverse and distorted religion of the Jews:[42] with criminal hatred, in sinful ways, they drove to the cross an innocent man who deserved well of them, and they were not in the least deterred from so monstrous a deed by reverence for the holy day; yet these Jews expressed superstitious solicitude about removing bodies from the cross. They approached Pilate so that on his orders they could break the legs of those hanging to hasten their dying and then the corpses could be removed from their midst so that they did not make the festival gloomy by being in sight. It was the great day which is called Parasceve [Preparation] in Greek, from the preparation of the sacred things, and the sacrosanct Sabbath was almost on them, when it was against divine law to do any work.[43] For now the reverent people, having carried out such a cruel crime, just as if it were a deed well done, had turned their thoughts to making a pure offering of the Mosaic sacrifice, not realizing that the true paschal lamb had already been sacrificed. Such a baneful thing is a piety located in physical objects which is not joined with the piety of the heart. And so when Pilate agreed, the soldiers broke the legs of each of the thieves, whom they had found still alive. But when they came to Jesus, since they saw him already lifeless, thinking it was superfluous, they did not break his legs. (The legs were broken so that those who were hanging would die quickly.[44]) But there was one of the soldiers standing there who, to make sure of our Lord Jesus' death, pierced[45] his side with a spear, and immediately blood and water flowed out of the wound, making plain in a great mystery that his death would wash us from sin and that it also would bestow on us eternal life. For baptism consists in water; in blood is human life.[46] Now it is not natural for water to flow from a wounded body.[47] But one who saw it with his own eyes has given evidence, and we know that his evidence is true. Jesus himself knows[48] that that witness tells the truth, so no one of you should hesitate to believe what would otherwise seem unbelievable.

Now although this seemed to be happening by chance, that is, that instead of his legs being broken his side was pierced, yet it was done by dispensation of the divine purpose, so that even in this regard the actual event would correspond to the predictions of the prophets. For among the other ceremonies with which Moses in Exodus directs that the Passover is to be celebrated, he had specifically prescribed that the lamb was to be killed in such a way that not a bone of it was broken. By this mark, of course, he made it plain that Jesus was the true Passover whose image the Mosaic lamb had borne.[49] For the blood of Jesus saves the believers from death, the mystical eating of Jesus makes us pass in freedom from Egyptian slavery, that is, from the lusts of the world and the tyranny of sin, into the heavenly land. And again the Spirit speaks through Zechariah: 'They will see him whom they have pierced.' For some day when he comes again with the same body with which he hung on the cross, though then glorified, he will nonetheless show the traces of the wound to all, and he will reproach the unbelievers for the well-spring opened in vain, in whose flow they could have been healed.[50]

And so, the death now certain and assured in the personal experience of many, it remained for his burial to strengthen faith in his resurrection in many ways.[51] But as Christ wanted his whole life to be humble, so he wanted his burial to be grand: not to teach us to be concerned about tombs,[52] but so that when the things that had to do with the dispensation of his humility were complete, he might then rehearse the glory of his resurrection. Now when honour is shown to one living it is not without suspicion or danger; but honour that is freely offered to one dead is a very sure testimony to his excellence. So there was a well-known and powerful man, Joseph, Arimathean by birth, who himself had been a disciple of Jesus but secretly, because of fear of the Jews, for they had passed a rule that anyone who proclaimed himself a disciple of Jesus would be banned from the synagogue.[53] He approached Pilate, to whom he was known,[54] and asked him for permission to remove Jesus' body from the cross. Having first found out whether Jesus was dead,[55] Pilate gave his consent. So Joseph went to the cross and took the body down. Meanwhile another assistant in the burial duties was added, in the person of Nicodemus, a man of outstanding rank among the Pharisees and himself a secret disciple of Jesus, who had earlier come to Jesus by night, as described above,[56] to avoid the ill will of the Pharisees. These men, knowing that resentment usually subsides after death,[57] and relying on the support of the governor, dared to offer the highest honour to the dead man whom they did not dare to meet openly while he lived. Nicodemus brought ointment made from myrrh and aloes, about a hundred pounds, which was enough to bury a body in grand style. Sharing the task, then, they removed the body of Jesus, coated it all over with the aromatics, and when it had been coated bound it in linen so the ointment would not run off, for it is the Jews' custom to bury bodies in this way so they do not decay. And they offered this degree of honour to the Lord Jesus as to a great and blameless man, lest anyone think that he had died because of his misdeeds. For so far they thought no more highly of him than that he was an innocent and upright man, and dear to God, to whose memory such honour was owed because he had been driven to death by envy of his excellence, which is what usually happens to outstanding men.[58] And this preparation was carried out on the spot so no one could suspect that the body had been exchanged.

And the Lord was buried right there, in a garden which was next to the site of the crucifixion. In the garden was a new tomb, recently cut out of the solid rock, in which no body had yet been laid. And though these things seemed to be done by chance, they made for faith in the resurrection. For the tomb could not be thought to have been tunnelled into since it was cut in the solid rock, and it was impossible to believe that anyone else had arisen from it since only he had been laid there. And yet Joseph and Nicodemus were not doing it for that reason, because in fact they had no hope that he would rise again, but they were stirred by the Jewish reverence for the holy day. For it was the Parasceve [Preparation] of the Jews, and the Sabbath was imminent,[59] when it was against divine law to do any work. Therefore so that the body would not be left unburied, or be buried with insufficient honour,[60] they laid it with very little trouble in the nearby tomb. The carefulness of the Jews was even put to the service of faith in the coming resurrection. For the Jews asked for and got guards from Pilate, and saw to it that they were posted at the tomb, so that no one could take the body away secretly; and not content with this, they put their seals on the huge rock with which the mouth of the tomb was shut[61] – the wickedness of the Jews in every way resulting in the glory of Christ, whose name they were trying to destroy.

Chapter 20

And indeed the other disciples, stricken both with fear and with despair, gave no thought to a funeral. However, some of the women disciples had the same concern that had gripped Joseph and Nicodemus, but observance of the festival had kept them from the business of preparing the aromatics.[1] So as soon as the Passover Sabbath had ended, the ointments were prepared that night, and early in the morning on the first day of the following week, before it was fully light, Mary Magdalene went to the tomb. When she saw the rock which had shut the entrance to the tomb moved away and the tomb open, she supposed only that during the night the body had been removed for proper burial. For the body had been placed there temporarily, as if to be honoured with a proper funeral soon thereafter. The hope of resurrection had dropped out of the minds of all of them, distraught as they were by the actual death of the Lord. So Mary shrank back from the tomb without looking inside, and ran to Simon Peter, who was with the disciple whom Jesus loved, and said, 'The Lord has been taken from the tomb, and I don't know[2] where the people who moved him have transferred him.'

Aroused at these words, both the men went outside. They had indeed a very slender hope but were gripped by a great longing for so beloved a teacher. And so together they hurried to the tomb at a run, but the disciple whom Jesus loved outran Peter and came to the tomb first. When he found the entrance open, he did not actually go in but leaned forward and peered into the tomb to see if it was empty. And he saw that there was no body there, but the linens in which the body had been wrapped were left, coated with the aromatics, and also the cloth with which Jesus' head had been covered, not together with the linens but rolled up and put to one side.[3] Hence it was readily apparent that the body had not been removed by thieves, who would have taken away the whole body, wrapped as it was, along with its aromatics, its linens, and the other cloth, if not because of the value of the items certainly because they would not have had time to remove the ointments, stickier than any birdlime, from the body and to arrange everything in its rightful place.[4] Such as it was, this was the first hope presented of resurrection. Soon Peter was there too; and once he had learned the situation from John, as he had been the slower in running he was likewise the bolder and more eager in making an investigation. For not satisfied to peer into the tomb, he even went inside. He was followed by the other disciple, who had peered in but did not dare to enter by himself; but the addition of a companion took away part of his fear.

And now they saw at first hand what the one had seen dimly, so to speak: there was no body anywhere, only grave-clothes, so taken off and arranged in piles that it seemed to have been done not by thieves in hasty confusion but at leisure. Even so they did not yet believe that he had come to life again; they only thought that what Mary had said was true, that the body had been taken from the tomb.[5] For although they had heard from Jesus that he would rise again, it had not implanted itself deep into their hearts, and whatever had taken root had been shaken out by the fear and confusion of the cross. For they had not yet reached a profound understanding of the scriptural prophecy, which had beyond all doubt predicted what was going to happen, that Jesus would die and on the third day[6] live again. So the two disciples went off whence they came.

But Mary, in incredible love and longing for the Lord, was not to be torn from the tomb, searching for one dead whom she had loved while he lived, and desiring to perform what was due to the lifeless corpse now that enjoyment of his living self was denied. And she stood outside by the entrance to the tomb, doing nothing but crying and looking about to see if there might be some glimmer of hope of finding the body. Now as she cried, though she did not dare to go inside, she craned her neck and peered into the tomb herself; and she saw two angels, gentle and glad in appearance,[7] sitting in separate spots, one at the head and the other at the foot of the place where the body had been laid. This glad and cheerful and peaceful sight took away in some measure the terror of the tomb, the darkness, and the desolation. Then too, the angels for their part, to comfort her grief, addressed her as she wept. 'Woman,' they said, 'why are you crying?' And she, drunk with the force of her love, said, 'Because they have taken my Lord away, and I do not know where they have laid him.' She called him her Lord, and still loved him though he was dead, having no hope as yet about the resurrection. She was in so much torment only because she had no access to his corpse.[8]

As she said this she guessed from the angels' faces that someone was standing behind her, and without waiting for the angels' answer, she looked around. And there she saw Jesus standing, on whom the angels had been gazing with awe, but Mary did not realize that it was Jesus. For he appeared in humble guise so as not to frighten the woman with the sudden sight of his true appearance.[9] So, to give her courage, he addressed her gently in the same words that the angels had used: 'Woman, why are you crying? Whom do you seek, looking around you in every direction?' She, supposing that he was the gardener, the caretaker and watchman of the place where the tomb was (for it was in a garden), said to him with feminine directness, 'Sir,[10] if you have taken him away, tell me where you have hidden him, and I will remove him.' For she supposed that some friend, out of fear of the Jews, had arranged to have the body secretly carried away lest it fall into Jewish hands and be treated otherwise than he would want.[11] So Jesus, delighted at the woman's great longing, addressed her now in his known and familiar voice: 'Mary.' Turning suddenly at this well-known sound (for she had turned back to the angels, she was so driven hither and thither by her sudden emotions), the woman recognized Jesus. Seized by sudden joy the disciple called her mentor by his usual title: 'Rabboni,' which in Syrian[12] means 'Teacher,' and at the same time falling before him she tried to kiss his feet, still remembering their former closeness.[13]

But knowing that so far she did not think anything great about him, though she loved him honestly and ardently, Jesus kept her from touching his body. For Mary saw him resurrected, but she thought that he had come to life again for nothing other than to carry on his relations with his friends in his usual way, once dead but now alive; she did not know that he now possessed an immortal body that must be treated with more reverence, a body which the Lord never showed to the wicked nor allowed to be touched by just anyone, so that he might gradually guide [us][14] entirely away from love of the body. 'Do not touch me,' he said; 'it is the same body that hung on the cross, but now adorned with the glory of immortality. But your feelings still smack of the flesh, because I have not yet ascended to my Father; when I do, I shall send you all the Spirit as comforter,[15] who will make you perfect and worthy of my spiritual fellowship. For now, Mary, let your longing be satisfied to have looked at me and heard me speaking. Instead, go to my brothers, in despair because of my death, and share with them, as quickly as you can, the joy that you have gotten from seeing me; and report to them in my own words that I live again for this reason: that when I have spent some days with them[16] I may leave earth and ascend to him who is the Father shared by both me and all of you, and the God shared by both me and all of you. Let them therefore lay aside their earthly feelings and direct their heart to spiritual and heavenly matters.' So Mary obeyed; she returned to the disciples and announced that she had seen the Lord, and reported what he had told her to report in his name. Hence they took considerable comfort from the fact that he had now called them brothers, and they prepared their hearts for the desire for everlasting and spiritual things, since the enjoyment of his physical presence would not last long.

With these and some other appearances[17] our Lord Jesus had gradually lifted the spirits of his followers to cheerfulness and hope that the resurrection had taken place. On the same day, the first of the week (because it followed the Passover Sabbath[18]), when it was already evening and the disciples had secretly gathered together – for from fear of the Jews they did not venture to meet in daylight – after the doors were shut Jesus came in. Standing in their midst in the sight of all, to take away all their fear he greeted them in his gentle and well-known voice, saying, 'Peace to you.' And to keep them from thinking him a ghost or some other kind of creature, he showed them the marks of the nails in his hands, and the scarring from the soldier's spear in his side. Their faith was strengthened by the greeting and the sight, and their sorrow removed, and the hearts of the disciples were gladdened. For Jesus had promised them that in a little while he would see them again, and that when the sight of him was returned to them and their sorrow was wiped away, he would gladden their heart.[19] At the same time he reminded them of what he had said, that they would have sorrow in the world but peace in him.[20] So in order further to strengthen the apostles,[21] already gladdened, he again greeted them with the sign of peace, saying, 'Peace to you,' and at once commanded with complete authority the preaching of what they had seen.[22] He said, 'As my Father sent me, so I send you. I have faithfully glorified my Father's name; likewise faithfully, in harmony with each other,[23] you shall preach the Father's name and mine. Prepare your hearts to carry this out, since I, having carried out my mission, am now returning to the Father, from whom I shall send you a more bountiful supply of the Holy Spirit. For the time being, I myself share the Holy Spirit with you, as much as you are able to receive,' and with these words he breathed on their faces; and having bestowed the Spirit he added the authority to forgive sins for all the people who would be joined to him through proclamation of the gospel and baptism, and who through penitence for their former life would truly repent.[24] 'The sins of those whose sins you forgive,' he said, 'will be forgiven them, and those whose sins you do not forgive will remain in bondage to their sins.'

All this happened when the other disciples were gathered together. The only one absent was Thomas (which in Greek is Didymus, in Latin Twin[25]); he was one of the twelve whom the Lord had particularly appointed to the task of preaching the gospel. So when he came, the disciples, exulting with joy, told him that they had seen the Lord. Supposing that they had been deceived by some apparition, Thomas said he would not believe it unless his own eyes were witness, and that he would not even trust his own eyes unless he saw the fresh marks of the nails in Jesus' hands and with his hand on Jesus' side felt the wound from the spear. And by divine dispensation the disbelief of the apostle made for the strengthening of our faith.[26] Eight days later, then, when the apostles had again gathered together at a secret meeting, and Thomas, still disbelieving, was there with the others, after the doors had been closed the Lord came in, and standing in the midst of his followers, he greeted them in his now usual and well-known fashion: 'Peace to you.'

Then he turned to Thomas (whose disbelief he knew, since nothing escaped him[27]); because he knew that this disbelief came not from wickedness as did that of the Pharisees but from human weakness, he thought it fitting to heal it. He said, 'Since it is not enough for you, Thomas, to have heard from so many people who had seen me and heard me unless your faith is made certain by all your own senses, put your finger here in the wounds from the nails, and look at the actual marks of the metal; bring your hand to my side and touch the wound from the spear. And from now on do not be so disbelieving in other matters, but have faith in my promises, however unbelievable in the accepted human sense – after you see that this which seemed to you unbelievable is a fact.' When Thomas had seen and touched, recognizing both the face and the familiar voice of the Lord, now on receiving full faith he cried out, 'My Lord and my God!' For though he had been rather reluctant to believe, yet no one proclaimed more clearly the God and the man.[28] Indeed the touch of the body that had hung dead on the cross a little while ago gave witness that a real person had risen again, and his knowledge of hidden things proved his divine power. Jesus did embrace Thomas' declaration, but he rebuked his reluctance to believe, saying, 'Thomas, you believe[29] because you have seen me, because you have heard and touched me. But those who believe when they have not seen will be blessed.'[30]

Our Lord Jesus made clear his divine power to his disciples in many other signs indeed, which are not written in this book; some are recorded by the other evangelists and some are told by word of mouth by those who saw and heard them.[31] For it was not my concern to write down everything, which would have been endless;[32] but it seemed worth while to publish in written form some things so that from them you might believe that Jesus was the Son of God.[33] And if you do, the blessedness will be yours that our Lord Jesus promised to those who believe when they have not seen. For as he suffered death and lives immortal, so you too by proclamation of his name will attain life everlasting.

Chapter 21

Now in order to strengthen the faith of his disciples more and more, Jesus appeared to them often, talking with them, sometimes even taking food with them, so that no suspicion could implant itself in their minds that what they had seen was a ghost or illusion.[1] And yet in this period he was not with them at all times, as he had been before his death, and he did not exercise the same familiarity towards them, not being visible to everyone, since he had predicted he would appear to his own, not to the world, and not being visible even to his own except when he chose.[2] For now his immortality presented an awesome appearance and one full of majesty, so that when their faith was strengthened he might remove the sight of his physical being completely from them and then be with his followers spiritually. And so again he made himself visible to the disciples by the lake which is called Tiberian. He showed himself in this way.

The disciples, who earlier had been in hiding at Jerusalem, had gone into Galilee to be safe from the Pharisees,[3] and several of them were together there, namely Simon Peter and Thomas (the one also called Didymus), as well as Nathanael, whose birthplace was Cana of Galilee, where Jesus had turned water into wine,[4] and also the two sons of Zebedee, John and James the elder,[5] and with them two other disciples. Now since they were deprived of the Lord's resources, through whom they had been regularly supported from the voluntary kindness of his friends, Peter returned to his original craft whereby he had earned a livelihood for himself with his hands, so that he would not be a burden to anyone or be supported in leisure on anyone's generosity. For preaching was not permitted, and he did not think it right that one who was not in service to the gospel should live off the gospel.[6] So towards nightfall (since it was not yet safe enough to go out in public in daylight[7]), Peter said, 'I'm going fishing.' And the others said, 'We'll come with you too, so we can fish together.' So they left the house together and got into the boat and laboured at their fishing all that night without success. For they caught nothing, so that an opportunity for a miracle might be provided, and also so that, as in a riddle, it would be a sign that the work of the evangelist is in vain unless Christ prospers human effort.

Now when the dawn came, Jesus stood on the shore; even so the disciples did not recognize him, partly because of the distance, partly because of the still uncertain light, and partly because the Lord did not choose to be recognized immediately. So Jesus spoke to them from the shore, saying, 'Lads, do you have any fish to eat?' Since they did not even recognize the Lord's voice but supposed that it was someone or other who had come to the lake to buy fish,[8] they answered that they had nothing to sell him because they had not caught anything. Then, to make it gradually known who he was, Jesus said, 'Cast your net on the right side of the boat and you will find what you couldn't so far.' They did as he told them, for weariness of the work spent in vain and eagerness for a catch gave them hope. Soon such a multitude of fish was caught that the laden net could hardly be drawn to the boat. This of course was a type of the multitude of people who after the apostles' preaching would be joined to the church from all the tongues and nations of the world.[9]

Alerted by the novelty of the event, the disciple whom Jesus loved recognized Jesus, and quickly advised Peter, who was completely taken up with pulling in the net, that the man standing on the shore, who had told them to let down the net, was the Lord. Peter – and it was just like him – when he understood that it was the Lord, forgot both the net and the fish, and snatched up his shirt[10] (for he had taken it off earlier), and brooking no delay hurled himself into the lake and so was the first to reach the Lord. The other disciples followed in the boat (for they were not far from the shore, only about a hundred yards), dragging the net laden with fish. When they landed, they saw a charcoal fire burning on the shore, and a fish on the fire, and a loaf of bread as well.[11] Jesus told them also to bring some of the fish they had just caught. So Peter, going back onto the boat, landed the net filled with large fish, 153 by actual count. This point also enhanced the miracle, that though the number of fish was so great and the fish themselves so huge,[12] the net was still not torn by its load. This fact prefigured that the church, humble and in the world's view weak and constrained, would nonetheless embrace all the nations of the world under the protection and favour of our Lord Jesus.

But now to give an even more definite proof that he was a real person, not a ghost, though he had proved the reality of his body in being seen by their eyes, heard by their ears, and touched by their hands, he was even willing to take food with them.[13] Hence he invited his followers to the meal that was prepared. The disciples sat down to eat, but in silence. For the majesty of his now immortal body had taken away their customary self-confidence. They did indeed recognize the Lord, but as being more awe-inspiring in appearance.[14] Thus no one dared ask him who he was, because in fact they knew that he was the Lord, granted that the appearance of his body was altered. Jesus approached the banquet and according to his custom passed out to them the bread broken with his own hands, and likewise the fish, in the doing teaching his followers, whom he had chosen as shepherds of his church, that they were to feed the gospel flock on sacred teaching, as it was handed down from him.[15] This was the third day on which Jesus at times showed himself to be seen by his followers, for he was not with them continuously.

When the meal was finished, as if explaining what he had meant by the action, our Lord Jesus entrusted his sheep to Peter to be fed, but only while asking[16] three times for a pledge of Peter's love for him. He did so to impress on the hearts of his followers that no one was a fit shepherd of the gospel flock except him who had such love for those entrusted to his charge as Christ has shown for his followers, whom he had purchased with his life. Furthermore, he spoke particularly to Peter to wipe out the memory of Peter's denial, indicating that he would have the chief place in the service of the gospel because he surpassed the others in love for the Lord's flock.[17] So through this man, who he knew was more passionate of heart than the others, he wished to express a model of the true and perfect shepherd for all the apostles and their successors. What is more, Peter in other circumstances also was regularly the mouthpiece,[18] as it were, of the apostles, and the Lord wanted to have it heard through him what the others also were to proclaim. Indeed, the proclamation of the whole church made in his words had already earned the promise of the keys of the heavenly kingdom.[19] Likewise on the present occasion the Lord wanted a proclamation of the highest love for himself to be made in this man's words so that through the one the others might learn what sort of people ought to approach the care of the Lord's flock. 'Simon son of John,' he said, 'do you love me more than these do?'[20] The Lord was not asking this as being unaware that he was loved most by Peter, but he wished to leave it fixed deep within the hearts of his followers that he who undertakes the care of the Lord's flock, for whom the Lord himself had undergone the punishment of the cross, must have the highest love for Jesus. But Peter, by now having become more cautious than he had usually been, made no answer about how much the others might love the Lord, since he had not searched out the others' hearts,[21] but answered from his knowledge of himself alone, of which he even ventured to make the Lord a witness. He said, 'How much each of the others may love you, I do not know; I love you, Lord, and you know it when you ask. Since you know the secrets of human minds, you know that I love you.' Then Jesus said, 'If you love me as you declare, feed my lambs, who are very dear to me and whom I have purchased with my life. And be to them as I have been to you. This will be the proof of your perfect love for me.'

Our Lord Jesus asked him again in the same words,[22] 'Simon son of John, do you love me?' Peter answered him in the same words: 'I love you, Lord; you yourself know that I love you.' Then again Jesus said, 'If you really love me, feed my lambs, whom I hold very dear.'

A third time the Lord asked Peter, 'Simon son of John, do you love me?' The Lord's question, repeated so many times, cast a worry and sorrow on Peter. For though he knew in himself that he loved the Lord greatly, still, his triple denial of the Lord after such grand promises made him distrust even himself.[23] For in Peter's case it had happened that his backsliding was in furtherance of his salvation, for he had learned self-restraint and unlearned self-confidence, which is the bane most fatal to devotion to the gospel. So he answered honestly indeed, but hesitantly and modestly, all his confidence now transferred to him in whom alone confidence should be placed: 'Lord, why do you ask so often, when nothing escapes you? You yourself know that I love you.' At that Jesus said, 'Then feed my sheep and make known to them what value you put on me. You shall take the model of a good shepherd from me. I paid with my life for my sheep; you also shall be a faithful shepherd of my sheep even to the point of loss of life and livelihood.[24] They whom I redeemed with my own blood are mine; now, since I am about to return to the Father, I entrust them to you for feeding. You shall be their shepherd, not their master, and shall feed them to preserve them; you shall not slaughter or skin[25] them so that you destroy them. If I am triply dear to you, they whom I hold most dear will be dear to you.' The Lord Jesus wanted these things to be impressed on his disciples' hearts so very carefully because he was well aware that some would arise who not out of love for Jesus but for the sake of their personal advantage would undertake the care of the Christian people – or rather would snatch it up, for they would be tyrants and thieves rather than shepherds.[26] Why, our Lord Jesus even saw fit to explain what the triple repetition of the declaration of love meant. The one who for the salvation of the Lord's flock scorns his own riches, disregards the honours of this world, disregards his own inclinations, gives great proof indeed of his honest love. But the one who does not hesitate to put his own life in danger for the salvation of the flock gives a most definite verification of his unbounded love.

Wanting to hint that some day Peter would do this very thing, the Lord said, 'I assure you most firmly, Peter, one day you will make good what you now declare. What is more, it is no unmanly declaration. For when you were younger, and in your physical strength more enduring of ills, you were regarded more indulgently. For you took off and put on your belt yourself as you chose, and you walked freely wherever it pleased you. But when you become old, weaker then in your physical strength, you will be treated more harshly, being by then stronger in spirit.[27] For you will stretch out your hands and someone else will put a belt on you, to lead you where you do not want to go.' In this riddle Jesus indicated in what sort of death Peter would some day glorify God. Indeed when he was quite old he was led to the cross, and though he would have borne it gladly for the unbounded love he had for his Lord, still, it made the weakness of his human nature tremble.[28]

On saying this, Jesus began to walk, and he said to Peter, 'Follow me,' again inviting him to the imitation of his love and death. When Peter looked back, he saw the disciple whom Jesus loved, and who had lain on the Lord's breast at the Last Supper while he tried to find out from him who the traitor was. Since Peter loved this one particularly and knew that he had always been dearer to the Lord than the others, and since without being told he was following close behind Peter, Peter asked the Lord what would happen about him. For he had now learned about his own death and he wished to know whether he would have the other as his companion in death.[29] For he thought that it was a glorious and strong evidence of the Lord's love for him that he was to imitate Jesus' death. But Jesus, correcting Peter's vain concern about the death of another, said, 'If I were to want this one to wait[30] until I come again, what is that to you? He is mine, and concerning him I will decide what will be best as I choose. As for you, see to what concerns you, namely, that you follow me.' So from the fact of this conversation a rumour arose among the disciples to the effect that the disciple beloved by Jesus would not die a violent death but would continue in life until the Lord returned to judge the living and the dead, which everyone at the time thought would happen soon. Yet Jesus had not said he would not die, but blunting Peter's curiosity, he said it did not concern Peter if the Lord wanted the other to wait until his coming.

And this is the very disciple who bears witness that these things happened in this way, and who has written this so that they might be more surely and widely disseminated for the knowledge of all. And we know that his witness is true. For he has not written what he heard from others, but about things at which he himself was present.[31] Even so, he did not record all that Jesus said or did. For if anyone were to try to relate them one by one, an endless quantity of books would be produced. But only so much has been published in writing as is sufficient for attaining salvation.[32] It remains, therefore, for us, believing in these things and keeping close in Jesus' footsteps, to hasten towards the prize of immortal life.[33]

ERASMUS OF ROTTERDAM, TO THE PIOUS READER, GREETING[1]

Certainly the whole gospel teaching, the whole life of Christ, breathes a new and marvellous love, but no one expresses this more than John the Evangelist, who, just as he was especially loved by the one who is eternal love, likewise speaks nothing else, breathes nothing else, than pure love, whether one reads his Gospel or his Epistles. This is of course the Christian love which teaches in brief whatever is taught in all the volumes of the Old Testament, all the books of the philosophers, all human laws; this is the love that of its own accord brings with it every virtue there is, and once and for all shuts out every vice. For since our highest happiness lies in knowledge, trust, and purity of life, we learn nothing more quickly or willingly than what we love passionately. Faith is as it were our eye, with which we see and know God, and that is enough for our eternal salvation and in accord with Holy Scripture.[2] Love, which views nothing falsely, all things clearly, makes this eye pure, simple, and dove-like.[3] Next to faith is trust, by which, not trusting in the world's resources or our own strength, we depend entirely on the goodness of God. Besides, true love urges upon us most convincingly this too, that we cast ourselves wholeheartedly upon him whom we wholeheartedly love. As for the third thing, since purity of life is to be sought chiefly either from the teachings of Christ or from his example, everyone is most willing to obey whomever he holds in the highest regard and loves the most. Finally, as to the hope of reward, though perfect love is neither moved by fear nor cares for rewards, we trust in the promises of no one more than those of him who we know by faith is all-powerful, and who in many trials we have realized and daily continue to realize is all-good. This, then, is as it were the centre-point of this Gospel, around which John steadily turns, never retreating from it.

Further, he postulates two circles or spheres, one heavenly and spiritual, another, which he calls the world, earthly and physical.[4] Neither of these can be pointed to with a finger, but each resides in our deepest feelings, though sometimes showing itself in our very actions, except in so far as actions are also pretended. There is only this difference between them: pretence is neither self-consistent nor enduring. In the heavenly sphere he puts God the Father, highest source of all good things, and joins to him the Son, through whom the Father creates, governs, and restores all things, and the Spirit, common to both, through whom the Father makes all things perfect. This sacred triad,[5] firmly united within itself and returning into itself, is the prime example of absolute love and harmony. All who cling to the gospel teaching with true hearts are adopted into it through faith and love. They are reborn as children of God, they are made brothers of Jesus, they share in the common Spirit, they are joined to the fellowship of immortality, for they become shoots of the eternal vine, they are made members of Christ. But no one can be admitted into this heavenly fellowship, or once admitted can continue, except one unstained by the desires of this world, although such purity in its perfect form does not befall anyone in this life. Here then is the intersection with the other sphere, which includes the greatest part of mankind. John makes Satan the prince or centre-point of this world. Satan has his impostor angels, just as God has his angels, servants of his holiness. He does not have a triad because he is a tyrant,[6] loving to be alone and not permitting anyone to share his throne. He also has his apostles and confederates through whom he works, as Christ works through his saints. For in gospel times he had scribes, Pharisees and priests, Herods, several leaders of the people, who, loving the things of this world, were opposed to the teaching of Christ. Christ has had enemies of this kind in every age, and he always will. Further, it is very difficult to distinguish these two spheres, which are tangled together in countless ways. The surest sign is that those who are truly Christ's long for nothing but Christ's glory even to their own dishonour, and for nothing but Christ's profit, even at the cost of their own lives. They pursue nothing for themselves, they claim nothing good for themselves, they have no ambition except to please Christ. By him alone they measure all their happiness. Conversely, those who are in bondage to the world are anxious for their own advantage, their own glory, their own profit, their own pleasure, to the neglect of God and even the injury of their neighbour; and if sometimes they make a pretence from religious scruple, still they do not draw back from their focal point. Each sphere has its own resources and consolations. The world has wealth, office, position, power, exile, prison, and death; the gospel sphere has an upright conscience, the Spirit as comforter, and the love that sweetens even the bitterest things. Each sphere has its own rewards. Besides the fact that the world promises false goods and even in those is often deceiving, it can promise nothing after life. Christ promises a share in eternal life, and in the mean time here more real tranquillity than the world can provide for its followers. He only wants all trust, all glory, all hope transferred to himself alone.

Since this is handed down to us in the writings which we receive exactly as the voice issuing from the mouth of Christ, why is it that almost the entire life of Christians differs so greatly from this teaching? We all alike profess the gospel, and no one performs the gospel. What part of life is not corrupted by lust, greed, ambition, envy, hatred, whether one considers the world's princes or the princes of the church or the common people or those who profess more than the gospel religion as if they were twice Christians?[7]

Where is there any trace of genuine love among them? Where is there simple friendship, innocent of deceit? Who does not arrange for his own advantage to his neighbour's disadvantage? Who does not claim as much as possible for himself, and take it from his neighbour? Where do the endless wars and tumults come from? Weigh the goal against so much loss of Christian blood – it is trifling, contemptible, ephemeral. Yet how else do we live than like beasts, tearing each other to pieces? And with these deeds we promise ourselves heaven, where the highest peace is, and perfect love! In what are we trusting when we make such a promise? Because once on the point of death we made our confession; because we paid money for a papal certificate that releases us from purgatory; because when we were dying we gave orders for many extravagant memorial services[8] to be held for us after we are buried; because we hired someone to make a pilgrimage for us to Jerusalem, or St Peter's threshold, or Compostela?[9] Not to mention even more foolish things than these, such as when someone who is about to die thinks he will be safe if he is buried in the habit of a Franciscan or a Dominican.[10] What is the source of so much ignorance among Christians? Surely it is that we do not read the gospel, or if we do, we read it casually and carelessly. I have added this, excellent reader, because several pages happened to be blank. Farewell.

Notes

Translator's Note

xi

1 For a detailed account of the composition and publishing history of all the *Paraphrases*, see 'The Publication of the Latin *Paraphrases*' CWE 42 xx–xxix. A critical edition of the *Paraphrases*, under the editorship of Irena Backus, is expected soon in the ASD collection of Erasmus' works.
2 The purpose and nature of the *Paraphrases* are discussed more fully in 'The *Paraphrases* of Erasmus: Origin and Character' CWE 42 xi–xix.
3 See Epp 1308, 1323, 1341A:760–3.
4 Ep 1323:25–8, 29 November 1522

xii

5 Cf 2–3 and 12 below.
6 Books of the Bible are abbreviated according to the CWE standard system, except that citations of the Fourth Gospel regularly appear with chapter and verse number only, omitting 'John.'

xiii

7 *De copia* CWE 24 295:21–2, 301:14–22
8 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* and Augustine *Tract in Joannem* are cited by the standard unit and subunit numbering that appears in the Greek and Latin editions and in the various English translations. Cyril *Comm in Joannem* and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* are available only in PG. My citations of Cyril in PG add column and section numbers because the PG units are several pages long; citations of Theophylact in PG omit column and section numbers because the PG units, by chapter and verse of the Gospel, are typically less than one PG column.
9 Cyril *Comm in Joannem*, however, was only available for 1:1 through 7:24 and 12:49 through 21:25. The middle four books were lost; even today books 7 and 8 are known only in fragments. Erasmus' Cyril was the Latin translation of George of Trebizond; he did not have, apparently, access to a Greek text. At one stage before 1522 Erasmus had made use of a printed edition of Cyril that appeared to contain the lost books 5–8, but, as he discovered to his annoyance, they had been patched together by the editor of the edition,

who supplied an inventive mixture of Chrysostom and Augustine to cover the missing material. See Jane E. Phillips 'Erasmus, Cyril, and the *Annotationes* on John' *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 50 (1988) 381–4.

xiv

10 Neither the *Gloss* nor Hugh nor Nicholas is available in a modern edition. See the list of Works Frequently Cited for the editions I have used. I have added chapter and verse references to the page citations from those editions. Citations of the *Gloss* are of the marginal *Gloss* unless the interlinear *Gloss* is specified.

xv

11 A convenient Latin text of the *Annotations* on this Gospel is in Anne Reeve *Erasmus' Annotations on the New Testament: The Gospels* (London: Duckworth 1986). For a general description see Erika Rummel *Erasmus' 'Annotations' on the New Testament: From Philologist to Theologian* Erasmus Studies 8 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press 1986).

12 The history of these controversies, and of the works Erasmus wrote in response to them, is briefly surveyed by Erika Rummel 'A Reader's Guide to Erasmus' Controversies' *Erasmus in English* 12 (1983) 13–19. A more detailed account appears in a two-volume work by the same author: *Erasmus and His Catholic Critics I: 1515–1522* and *II: 1523–1536* (Nieuwkoop: De Graaf 1989).

PARAPHRASE ON JOHN

Dedicatory Letter

2

1 Erasmus' dedicatory letter to the paraphrase on the Gospel of John is addressed to Archduke Ferdinand of Austria, who was twenty years old in March 1523. The letter is Ep 1333. The translation and notes given here are those of CWE 9; the notes have been amplified and renumbered by the translator of the present volume. For Ferdinand's relationship with Erasmus, see Peter G. Bietenholz and Thomas B. Deutscher eds *Contemporaries of Erasmus: A Biographical Register of the Renaissance and Reformation* II (Toronto: University of Toronto Press 1986) sv 'Ferdinand I.'

2 Cf Ep 1255.

3 See Ep 1255:25–31, 82–6.

4 The archbishop of Mainz and the bishop of Rochester had both encouraged Erasmus to undertake the paraphrase on John; Epp 1308:21–4, 1323:22–8.

3

5 This sentence was criticized as impious by the Paris theologian Noël Béda. Erasmus replied in the *Supputatio* (LB IX 622A–E) with the observation that the Doctors of the church had found this very quality of Jesus' teaching a mark of his mercy towards weak human understanding. Cf eg the paraphrase on 2:19–22 and nn35 and 42.

6 John 1:1
7 John 1:2
8 John 1:3–5. The punctuation of the quotation follows the Vulgate; cf the paraphrase on 1:3–4 nn30 and 34.
9 The phrase translated as 'in my introductions' is *in argumentis*. The stylistic feature to which Erasmus refers here is discussed in the *argumentum* which precedes the paraphrase on the First Epistle of John (LB VII 1142) and also in the 1527 annotation on John 1:3 (*et sine ipso factum est nihil*). There is no *argumentum* in the paraphrase on this Gospel. On the 'arguments' see Ep 894 and the introductory note to that letter; but the existence, mentioned in that note, of a 1506 translation by Erasmus of the New Testament has been disproved by Andrew J. Brown 'The Date of Erasmus' Latin Translation of the New Testament' *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 8:4 (1984) 351–80.

4
10 Ep 1270
11 See Ep 1323 n1.
12 See Ep 1323 n2.

5
13 That is, giving someone something he does not need; *Adagia* II iii 20: *Ranis vinum praeministras* 'You are serving wine to frogs'
14 Since Erasmus was by no means hostile to the vernacular tongues (see eg Ep 1126:105–9) this must be a slighting reference to the non-literary Latin used in books on the practical subjects listed. Late-classical examples of such books are the *De re militari* (*On Warfare*) and *Mulomedicina* (*Equine Medicine*) of Vegetius or the *Cynegetica* (*On Hunting Dogs*) of Nemesianus, all addressed to members of Roman imperial families.
15 Eg *Iliad* 1.263, and often elsewhere in the *Iliad*, especially of the Greek king Agamemnon

6
16 Cf Luke 6:24.
17 Cf Matt 25:14–30, Luke 19:12–27.

8
18 On Erasmus' attitude towards the Jews, see Ep 694 introduction. But see also Heiko A. Oberman *The Roots of Anti-Semitism in the Age of Renaissance and Reformation* trans James I. Porter (Philadelphia: Fortress Press 1984) 38–40 and 58–9, and Shimon Markish *Erasmus and the Jews* trans Anthony Olcott, with an afterword by Arthur A. Cohen (Chicago: University of Chicago Press 1986).
19 Cf Ep 563:24–31 and the *Enchiridion* CWE 66 70.

9
20 This passage, beginning above at 'Sometimes they are persuaded,' was censured as Lutheran by the Paris theologian Noël Béda. Erasmus replied in the *Divinationes* LB IX 481A–E, *Elenchus* LB IX 499F–500A, and finally at length in the *Supputatio* LB IX 622E--624B, pointing out that he never rejected princes'

attendance at mass or saying of the offices; he only said that these are not the chief duties of princes, as the passage itself makes clear.

10

21 Solomon; see 2 Chron 1:10.

22 Wisd 9:4, 10–12, 17–18

23 This sentence also was criticized by Noël Béda and by the Paris faculty of theology, who read it as a Lutheranizing assault on scholastic theology. Erasmus replied to Béda in the *Supputatio* LB IX 624B–E and to the faculty in the *Declarationes ad censuras Lutetiae vulgatas* LB IX 910F–911C, arguing that he was not condemning scholastic theology or theologians out of hand, only the excesses that had resulted from closer attention to intellectual systems than to the energy of the gospel.

24 Almost simultaneously with the *Paraphrase on John* Erasmus published an edition of the works of Hilary of Poitiers; see the dedicatory letter to that edition, Ep 1334, also dated 5 January 1523. Cf just below, n26.

11

25 Cf Eph 6:15 and Rom 10:15 (Vulgate).

26 The Cerinthians were the followers of Cerinthus, a Gnostic teacher in Asia Minor c 100 AD who denied the virgin birth and the divinity of Christ. The Ebionites were Jewish Christians who insisted on the observance of the whole law, viewed Paul as an apostate, and held views like those of Cerinthus on the person of Jesus. Cf n28 below. The Ebionites are one focus of Hilary's anti-heretical polemics in *De Trinitate*, eg at 1.26, 2.4.

27 1 Cor 2:6 and 2

12

28 In his *Adversus omnes haereses* 3.11.1, Irenaeus asserts that John wrote his Gospel especially against the errors of Cerinthus (n26 above). For the widespread belief in the early church that this Gospel was intended to refute various heresies, cf the paraphrase on John 1 (preface) n11.

29 For an account of Erasmus' views on the nature of scriptural paraphrases, cf 'The *Paraphrases* of Erasmus: Origin and Character' CWE 42 xv–xviii.

Chapter 1

13

1 Erasmus introduces the paraphrase proper on this Gospel with a kind of author's preface formally analogous to that with which Luke opens (Luke 1:1–4; cf the *Paraphrase on Luke* on these verses). In it he maintains the persona of the Evangelist; as he states in Ep 1274, maintenance of the authorial persona is one of the characteristics of paraphrase. The author's preface continues to 17 below. The whole section is replete with commonplaces of patristic thought; only a few examples will be cited for each.

2 'Parallels' here translates *similitudines*, a term that covers a broader range of ideas than just the highly specific English term 'similes.' Cf *De copia* 1.19 and 2 (LB I 19C and 94B–95A / CWE 24 337 and 621–3). The necessity for and

inadequacy of figurative language in treating of the incomprehensible and inexpressible is a theological commonplace. See eg Isa 40:18, 46:5; Mark 4:30; Hilary *De Trinitate* 1.19, 4.2; Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 2.4; Augustine (on other parts of this Gospel) *Tract in Joannem* 46.3, 47.6, 53.3; Pseudo-Dionysius *De divinis nominibus* 7.

3 Cf Eph 1:18. This and similar expressions are favourites of Erasmus; cf eg the paraphrase on 6:41 and 45, on 9:1 and 7, and *Pio lectori*, the afterword to the *Paraphrase on John*, 226 below. It is frequent also in Augustine, eg *Tract in Joannem* 2.16, 3.19–21, 13.3.

4 Cf Matt 11:27, Luke 10:22.

5 The dangers of human reason's investigation of the nature of God are pointed out by eg Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 7.1 and Hilary *De Trinitate* 2.2 and 5. In the introduction to the collected works of Hilary that he published in 1523 almost simultaneously with the *Paraphrase on John*, Erasmus draws attention to Hilary's awareness of this danger, and inveighs against the modern tendency to disregard it (Ep 1334:161–212).

6 Another theological commonplace; in addition to the passages of Chrysostom and Hilary cited in n5, see eg Isa 43:10 and Hebr 11:3; Hilary *De Trinitate* 1.8 and 12; Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 38.10, 40.9.

14

7 The sufficiency of the synoptic Gospels, and the contrast between their emphasis on the human nature of Jesus and this Evangelist's emphasis on his divine nature, are also pointed out by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 4.1, Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 36.1 (on 8:15–18), and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (*praefatio*). Cf also the *Gloss* (on 1:1) 185v and Nicholas of Lyra (on 1:1) 185r–v. See nn77 and 82 below.

8 Erasmus had said in a 1516 annotation on 1:1 (*et verbum erat apud deum*) that he doubted whether 'anywhere in the Epistles or Gospels the appellation of God is found openly attributed to Christ, except in two or three places'; in 1519 he added 'though it is definitely concluded from many passages that Christ was God, not only man.' The comment met with protest from the Spanish Catholic Diego López Zúñiga in a work published in 1520 (cf ASD IX-2 17–18 and 44–5) and was removed in the 1522 edition of the annotations. Cf Jerry H. Bentley *Humanists and Holy Writ: New Testament Scholarship in the Renaissance* (Princeton: Princeton University Press 1983) 209–10 (with an error in the date of the revised note). In 1521 Erasmus had replied to this among other criticisms by Zúñiga of his *Annotationes in Novum Testamentum* in the *Apologia contra Stunicam*, where he gives the same sort of explanation he gives here, that the apostles refrained from calling Jesus God in order not to offend the sensibilities of their hearers, unaccustomed to such language, and thus erect an obstacle to the reception of the gospel: ASD IX-2 124–5. The present comment in the *Paraphrase on John*, however, is further restricted to the synoptic evangelists, not applied to the New Testament as a whole. Cf the paraphrase on 20:28 and n28; and the annotation on Rom 9:5 (*qui est super omnia Deus*).

15

9 Cf 20:30–1 and 21:25, and the paraphrases on these passages.

10 Cf the parable at Matt 13:24–30.

11 The view that this Gospel was written to refute two major classes of heresy in the primitive church about the nature of the Jesus of the synoptics, one that he was truly divine and only apparently human, and one that he was essentially human with divine endowments, was widespread during the centuries when such heresies formed part of the debate around emergent trinitarian and soteriological theology; see n17. Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 3–7 and passim, Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 1 (on 1:1–2) PG 73 21C–24C and passim, Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (*praefatio* and passim), Hilary *De Trinitate* 2.1–12, the *Gloss* and Nicholas of Lyra (on 1:1) 185r–v, and Hugh of St Cher (on 1:1) 280r speak particularly of the heresies that deny Jesus' divinity. Both classes are mentioned by Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 1 and passim, especially *Tract in Joannem* 36.2. Erasmus himself points out the anti-heretical purpose of this Gospel both in the dedicatory letter to Ferdinand (11 above) and in the dedication to his 1523 edition of Hilary (Ep 1334:154–6).

12 'Spirit of Christ' is a Pauline expression; cf Rom 8:9.

13 'Make use of': *abutendum*, from *abuti*, the verbal form of the rhetorical figure called *abusio* or catachresis, 'misapplication.' Erasmus explains in *De copia* 1.19 that 'we resort to misapplication where a proper word does not exist' (CWE 24 337).

14 'The highest mind': *summa mens*. The description of God as, or as like, (the highest) mind is both pagan and Christian. Cf eg Plato *Timaeus* 39E, *Philebus* 28C–31A; Aristotle *Metaphysics* 12.7.7–9 (1072b 13–30); Cicero *De natura deorum* 1.26–37 passim, *Academica* 1.29; *Tusculan Disputations* 1.66; Virgil *Aeneid* 6.724–7; Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 3.4 (by implication); Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 1 (on 1:3) PG 73 84; Pseudo-Dionysius *De divinis nominibus* 1 and 7.

15 'Than which nothing greater or better can be conceived' is reminiscent both of the classic deduction of Anselm, that God is 'that thing than which nothing greater can be conceived' (*Proslogion* 2) and the similar statement of Augustine that 'God ... is so conceived of that the conception tries to hit on something than which nothing is better or more sublime' (*De doctrina christiana* 1.7.7).

16 'Word': *sermo*; here and throughout the paraphrase on chapter 1, as generally throughout the whole paraphrase, Erasmus' preferred expression for 'word' in its theological use as a name of the second Person of the Trinity is *sermo*, not the Vulgate *verbum* of 1:1. *Sermo* has the meaning of 'conversation,' 'talk,' 'discourse,' whereas *verbum* denotes 'a word' or 'expression,' a lexical item. Erasmus had introduced *sermo* to translate ὁ λόγος of 1:1 and 14 in his 1519 *Novum Testamentum*, and defended it in the annotations of that year; it promptly received much criticism, to which Erasmus replied in the subsequent editions of the annotations and in the 1520 *Apologia de 'In principio erat sermo'* (LB IX 111B–122E). Treatment of the controversy may be found in most works dealing with Erasmus or his religious thought, but see especially C.A.L. Jarrott 'Erasmus' *In principio erat sermo:* A Controversial Translation' *Studies in Philology* 61 (1964) 35–40, and Marjorie O'Rourke Boyle *Erasmus on Language and Method in Theology* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press 1977) 3–31. Boyle has a very full discussion of Erasmus' philological and theological under-

standing of *sermo* as the divine 'word,' and its sources. In this volume, the translation of *sermo* in statements about the second Person of the Trinity is 'word'; other uses will have other translations, unfortunately but unavoidably obscuring the self-referential nature of Erasmus' diction. (In the notes to chapter 6, however, notice is taken of Erasmus' use of *sermo*, because of the particular theological points at issue in that chapter.)

17 With this sentence as introduction, in the remainder of the paragraph Erasmus summarizes a rhetoric, or a theology, of the second Person of the Trinity, drawing on his wide reading of patristic and scholastic sources. The issue is of course one that had engaged the attention of Christian thinkers almost without exception, reaching its doctrinal expression in the first sections of the Nicene Creed. There is nothing in what Erasmus says here that could not be paralleled in any number of earlier works. Some immediate Latin influences on Erasmus' conception here can be deduced from the authorities he cites to defend his choice of *sermo* as the translation of ὁ λόγος, both in the *Apologia de 'In principio erat sermo'* (see n16 above) and in the various versions of the annotations on 1:1 (*erat verbum*); they include Tertullian *Adversus Praxean*, Cyprian *Testimonia*, Hilary *De Trinitate*, Ambrose *De fide*, Jerome, Augustine *Tract in Joannem*, Anselm of Canterbury, and Thomas Aquinas. One should also mention Augustine's *De Trinitate* and *De doctrina christiana*. Among Greek sources should surely be included Origen *De principiis*, and the commentators on this Gospel that Erasmus certainly used: Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem*, Cyril *Comm in Joannem*, and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem*. Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 1:1) in particular summarizes many conceptual parallels to this section of the *Paraphrase on John*. For a systematic treatment of the constituents of patristic thought on the λόγος reflected here, see any comprehensive theological encyclopedia or such works as J.N.D. Kelly *Early Christian Doctrines* 3rd ed (London: Adam and Charles Black 1965), or Jaroslav Pelikan *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine 1: The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100–600)* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press 1971).

18 For a similar thought, cf the paraphrase on 8:31–47 and n59. The contrasting idea is in the paraphrase on 5:19–20.

19 In this section 'speech' translates *oratio*, which was almost Erasmus' first choice, before *sermo*, as a Latin rendering of λόγος in 1:1; he rejected it because it is grammatically feminine, while *sermo*, like λόγος, is masculine, and would thus be congruent with the masculine *homo* 'human being,' 'man' in statements of the incarnation: *Apologia de 'In principio erat sermo'* LB IX 114A.

16

20 In *Adagia* I i 98: *Stultus stulta loquitur* 'Fools in their folly speak' Erasmus quotes the philosopher Democritus as calling speech 'the mirror of life' (in Diogenes Laertius 9.37) and comments, 'No mirror reflects the bodily appearance better or more definitely than speech reflects the image of the heart.' Similarly in *Adagia* I vi 50: *Qualis vir, talis oratio* 'As the man is, so is his talk,' after quoting Democritus again and related expressions in Seneca, Aristides, and Persius (none with the figure of a mirror), he says, 'In a word, a complete image of a man's way of life and the whole force of his character is reflected in

his style [*oratio*] as in a mirror, and the very secrets of his bosom can be detected from clues, as it were, that lie beneath the surface' (CWE 32 37). The phrase 'mirror of the mind' is used by Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 14.7, in a discussion of the concept 'word' and its various manifestations.

21 Cf the language of the Nicene Creed.

22 Besides its standing as orthodox Christian theology, the idea of the creator God creating out of innate goodness is also found in Plato *Timaeus* 29D–E.

23 Cf Ps 8:5–8 (Vulgate and AV), Heb 2:7 and 9.

24 For the idea that humanity can deduce the existence and nature of God from the created universe, cf Acts 17:23–8 and Rom 1:19–20; it is also found in Plato *Philebus* 29E and *Timaeus* 28C–29D.

17

25 Echoing and expanding on the Nicene Creed

26 With this sentence the actual paraphrase on 1:1 begins. In the editions published in Erasmus' lifetime the first marginal lemma from the Vulgate Gospel text appears here: *In principio erat verbum.*

27 'Not an emission in time': *non in tempore prolatus. Prolatus* is a verbal form related to *prolatio,* a patristic Latin translation of *προβολή* 'emission,' a technical term of the Gnostic Valentinians in Tertullian's time, who held that the Son was essentially different and separate from the Father; cf Tertullian *Adversus Praxean* 8 (where Tertullian tries to vindicate orthodox use of the word). Cf also the interlinear *Gloss* (on 1:1) 185v: 'a word not emitted [*prolatum*] but always remaining by him.'

28 For the themes of the coeternity and consubstantiality of Father and Son/word, and the distinction of persons, cf eg Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 1 (on 1:1–2) PG 73 21C–40C, Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 4.1–2, Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 1:2), and Nicholas of Lyra (on 1:1) 185v.

29 Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 1.11–12 in his treatment of 1:3 also specifically rejects this Arian heresy, that the Son was a creature of the Father; cf the Nicene Creed, 'begotten, not made.'

30 'Created all things that were created' presumes a punctuation of 1:3–4 that reads 'All things were made through him, and without him was nothing made that was made. In him was life ...' Erasmus gave this punctuation in his Latin version of the New Testament. As he remarks in a long annotation on 1:3–4 (*et sine ipso factum est nihil*), it is the punctuation favoured by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 4.3 and 5.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 1:4), who claim that the alternative punctuation '... without him was nothing made. What was made in him was life ...' is heretical. Yet that was the punctuation, as Erasmus goes on to say, of the contemporary Vulgate and was accepted by Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 1 (on 1:3–4) PG 73 85C–D, Hilary *De Trinitate* 2.18–20, and Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 1.16. Erasmus himself quotes 1:3–4 according to the Vulgate punctuation in the dedicatory letter to the *Paraphrase on John,* 3 above. See also n34. For a full discussion of the difficulties of the passage and their history, see Brown AB *John* 6–7.

31 'Visible and invisible' is the language of Col 1:16 and the Nicene Creed; the same language is used by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 5.1, Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 1 (on 1:3–4) PG 73 85C–D, and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 1:3).

32 A merely instrumental concept of the Son is specifically contrasted with true sonship by Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 1 (on 1:3) PG 73 80C, 84A–D (slave or servant only) and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 1:3) (both tool and servant). Theophylact names this an Arian heresy, a point also mentioned by Erasmus himself in the annotation on 1:3 (*omnia per ipsum facta sunt*).

33 'Begets': *gignit*, present tense, in the edition of 1535; but in the first three editions of the *Paraphrase on John* it had been *gignet* 'will beget.'

34 Here the paraphrase is accommodated to the contemporary Vulgate punctuation of 1:3–4, 'All things were made through him, and without him was nothing made. What was made in him was life ...' See n30.

18

35 That the 'light of mankind' in 1:4 and 5 is an intellectual one that connects the human mind with the wisdom of God is the view of Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 1 (on 1:4) PG 73 93B–C and Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 5.3, and is implied by Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 1:4).

36 Cyril *Comm in Joannem* (on 1:3) PG 73 77B has a similar sentence about those who walk in darkness and worship mute statues.

37 For 'firebrands of the prophets' cf Sir 48:1.

38 For a similar emphasis on the universality of the light, cf Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 5.3 and Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 1 (on 1:5) PG 73 101A–C.

19

39 Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 2.4 quotes Rom 1:20–2 and observes that some philosophers have learned of the creator through investigation of his creation; cf the references in nn14 and 22 above.

40 A similar stress on the gradualism of the revelation of God in Jesus as an accommodation to the weakness of human minds, exemplified in the preparatory mission of the Baptist, is in Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 6.1.

41 For the honour accorded the Baptist among those born of woman, cf Matt 11:11. 'God's messenger' translates Erasmus' *angelus*, the Latinization of the Greek ἄγγελος, the title given the Baptist at Mark 1:2, quoting Mal 3:1. Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 6.1 quotes the Malachi passage and notes that 'angel' refers to the messenger role; Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 1 (on 1:6, 7) PG 73 105B–C states more strongly that the Evangelist has included the word 'man' in 1:6 because there was already a story, arising from the misunderstanding of 'angel' as a form of existence rather than a function, that the Baptist was not really human but one of the heavenly angels in human disguise. The same point is made by Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 1:6). Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 1.4 virtually denies the humanity of the Baptist when he says that the wisdom of God 'entered John's heart in so far as he was not human ... [but] had become an angel' (though he explains that the humanity he denies the Baptist is the false humanity of thinking ourselves something when we are nothing). Cf Nicholas of Lyra (on 1:6) 186v: 'Though John was human by his natural condition, he was an angel by his office and his virginal purity.' Erasmus' paraphrase here aligns itself firmly with the Greek Fathers.

42 Isa 40:3–5, quoted in whole or in part at Matt 3:3, Mark 1:2–3 (with Mal 3:1),

Luke 3:4–6, and John 1:23. Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 1 (on 1:7) PG 73 108D refers to the prophecies and quotes Isa 40:3 and Ps 132:17 here.

43 Cf Matt 3:1–2.

44 Cf 3:19–21 and the paraphrase there.

45 Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 1 (on 1:7) PG 73 108D and (on 1:8) PG 73 109A–B also emphasizes here the sanctity of the Baptist's life.

46 Cf 1:19–20 and Luke 3:15.

47 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 6.1–2 also says here that the usual social practice is for recommendations to come from those of higher standing than the one they recommend, and that Jesus is introduced to the world by degrees.

48 Isa 60:1–2

20

49 The Baptist is called a lamp in 5:35, cited here by both Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 2.8 and Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 1 (on 1:8) PG 73 109C. Cyril draws attention to the importance of the article with 'light' in 1:8: he was not *the* light, that is, the one true light. The point was an important one for Erasmus as well, who in the annotation on 1:8 (*non erat ille lux*) refers to a question raised by some as to why Christ calls his disciples 'light of the world' in Matt 5:14 and the Baptist a 'lamp' in 5:35 if here the Baptist is denied the appellation 'light': 'But the addition or omission of the article cuts through this otherwise great knot; whenever he means the true and essential light, he adds the article. Here also when he denies John's being light, he does not say "he was not light" but "he was not *the* light, that true light of which I just spoke."' Erasmus then adduces the authority of Cyril on the point.

50 Both 'word' and 'words' translate Erasmus' *sermo* here.

51 The inclusion of angels in this elaboration of the illuminating role of the light is paralleled in Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 1 (on 1:9) PG 73 124C–128C, who speaks extensively of the enlightenment that comes through humans and angels, and its divine source.

52 Cf Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 8.1, who notes here that Christ was known to the eminently upright and virtuous before his earthly life.

53 At this point Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 8.1 also has a list of those not excluded from the light, but his is clearly based on Gal 3:28. Erasmus' list, while using the language of the first century AD, appears to reflect ethnic divisions more immediately pertinent to his own times.

54 Cf 3:19. The same point about the responsibility of those who choose not to accept the light is made here by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 8.1, Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 1 (on 1:10) PG 73 148C, and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 1:9).

55 Cf Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 2.10, where he says that God is in the world like an artisan directing what he has made, but not like a human workman separate from his handiwork; 'by the inherence of his majesty he makes what he makes; by his inherence he pilots what he has made.'

56 This definition of 'the world' of 1:10 as those who are devoted to worldly matters is paralleled by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 8.2, Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 2.11, and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 1:10).

57 Cf Exod 32 (the golden calf), Rom 1:23 (humans, birds, four-footed beasts,

snakes), Jer 2:27 (stones and logs). Pliny *Naturalis historia* 19.101 says, 'Egypt considers garlic and onions among the gods in swearing oaths.'

21

58 The same note of surprise that the Jews in spite of their preparation for a messiah rejected Jesus is sounded by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 9.1. Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 1 (on 1:11) PG 73 149B–152C also comments on the less harsh treatment of the ignorant gentiles by the Evangelist in 1:10, compared with his stronger statement about the Jews in 1:11.

59 Cf Isa 6.9–10, quoted in Matt 13:14–15 and Acts 28:26–7, John 12:40.

60 Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 1 (on 1:11) PG 73 149B–152C also here introduces the theme, an important one in the *Paraphrase on John*, of the transfer of the gospel grace from the Jews to the gentiles. Cf Rom 11:11 and the paraphrase on Rom 11; in fact much of the argument of Romans concerning the Jews and the gentiles is summarized in this and the next paragraph.

61 Cf eg Rom 11:23.

62 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 10.1 also introduces here the notion of the responsibility of those who do not choose to accept God's gifts.

22

63 Erasmus omits an antecedent for the relative clause.

64 'Of God' (*ex Deo*) was added in 1534.

65 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 11.1, in the discussion of 1:14, says that the effect of the incarnation was not the humiliation of the divine nature but the exaltation of human nature. Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 1 (on 1:14) PG 73 161D has a similar remark.

66 Cf Rom 8:15–17 and Gal 4:5–7, passages quoted here by Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 2.13.

67 In saying 'through bodily seed or sexual desire' Erasmus reduces to two the original three constituents of physical procreation listed in 1:13, 'not by blood, or by the desire of the flesh, or by the desire of a man.'

68 With the equation of 'flesh' and 'mortal body' here, cf 'human body' explained as 'the whole nature of a man' a few lines below. Erasmus had remarked in an annotation on 1:14 (*et verbum caro factum est*) that the use of 'flesh' is 'a Hebrew idiom, which denotes the whole person sometimes by the appellation of "soul" and sometimes "flesh"'; this is the explanation of Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 1 (on 1:14) PG 73 157D–161A and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 1:14).

23

69 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 11.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 1:14) both at this point argue against various heresies that denied the reality of Jesus' human body.

70 'The part by which we are in bondage to death' is the 'flesh' of 1:14. Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 1 (on 1:14) PG 73 157D–161A explains that 'flesh' is used here for 'human being' because it is the flesh alone that dies at death, and thus the flesh that is most in need of immortality; cf just below, 'in flesh now glorified.' Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 3.4 points out that we are chiefly different from animals and most like God with respect to our minds.

71 In an annotation on 1:14 (*et verbum caro factum est*) Erasmus notes that 'he dwelt ἐν ἡμῖν' can be properly translated either by the Vulgate's *inter nos* 'among us' or by *in nobis* 'within us.' There he approves the Vulgate's version; in the paraphrase it is represented by this sentence describing Jesus' human and social life. But in the following sentence Erasmus incorporates the other version as well, in a statement of the permanent indwelling of the Son in the hearts of believers, following Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 11.2.

72 For 'sitting at the right hand of the Father almighty,' cf Ps 110:1, Matt 26:64, Mark 14:62, and the Apostles' Creed.

73 The Gospel text here says 'glory *as* of the only-begotten.' Discussing the expression in an annotation on 1:14 (*gloriam quasi unigeniti*), Erasmus reports the observation of Chrysostom (*Hom in Joannem* 12.1, followed by Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem*, on 1:14) that 'as' here does not mean comparison but the revealed appearance of truth, 'as if, having described the royal equipage, one were to add "he went like a king," that is, with his royal equipage.' Erasmus also adds that 'from the Father' in 'glory as of the only-begotten from the Father' defines the source of glory more than it modifies 'only-begotten'; the paraphrase emphasizes the former interpretation but does not omit the latter.

74 See Matt 17:1–8, Mark 9:2–8, Luke 9:28–36; the mountain of the transfiguration, unnamed in the synoptic accounts, is identified as Mt Tabor by Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 1:14).

75 See Matt 3:13–17, Mark 1:9–11, Luke 3:21–2, and cf this Gospel at 1:32–3.

76 See 12:28.

77 See 20:24–9 (the tangibility of Jesus' resurrected body), Luke 24:50–3 and Acts 1:9 (the ascension). At this point Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 12.2 also has a summary of the evidences in which creation recognized its creator even in human form, a summary amounting to a recapitulation of the narrative of Jesus' life from the star and the angel choirs through the resurrection. In the *Paraphrase* all the allusions to the nativity follow a little below ('Now we will trace ...'; cf n82). Here the miracles and teachings have been mentioned summarily, while the chief emphasis is placed on the various manifestations of Jesus' divine glory. Nicholas of Lyra (on 1:14) 188r has a similar, though not identical, list of manifestations, drawn mostly from Matthew.

78 None of these details is in this Gospel; cf Matt 27:45–53, Mark 15:33–8, Luke 23:44–6.

79 For the thief's proclamation see Luke 23:42–3; for the centurion see Matt 27:54, Mark 15:39, Luke 23:47.

24

80 In an annotation on 1:14 (*plenum gratiae et veritatis*) Erasmus had pointed out that the Greek text, where the adjective 'full' is masculine like 'word' in the preceding sentence and 'John' in the following one, allows the possibility that the phrase 'full of grace and truth' describes the Baptist in what follows in 1:15 rather than the 'word' of the preceding material in 1:14. He added a number of parallels from the Old and New Testaments for calling individuals 'full of grace' but left it to the reader to make his own choice. The paraphrase, however, not only maintains the traditional assignment of the phrase to 'word'

but draws attention to the difference between the fullness of grace and truth in the Son and the divine gifts seen in ordinary mortals.

81 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 13.2 also repeats here the importance of gradualism in the introduction of Jesus' teachings and life to the human race, though he ties it closely to the role of the Baptist as forerunner and witness.

82 This list of nativity and early childhood wonders is also found in Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 12.2; cf n77 above. The allusions are to the accounts in the synoptics: Luke 2:8–20 (angel choir and shepherds); Matt 2:1–3 (star, Magi, and Herod); Luke 2:25–38 (Simeon and Anna); Luke 2:19, 33, 41–51 (childhood wonders). For Erasmus' understanding of the relation between this Gospel and the synoptics, cf his 'author's preface,' 14–15 above.

83 Cf Matt 3:2.

84 Cf 1:23; the quotation is from Isa 40:3. Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 1 (on 1:15) PG 73 165B quotes the Isaiah passage here and says that it lies behind the Evangelist's use of 'cried out' in 1:15.

85 Added from Matt 3:5–6, Mark 1:5, Luke 3:7 and 10; cf also John 3:23.

25

86 The paraphrase here explains 1:15 as an affirmation of the priority in rank and dignity of the human Jesus, following the exposition of Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 1 (on 1:15) PG 73 165C–169B and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 1:15), and the implication of Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 3.7. Erasmus has two long annotations on the passage (*qui post me venturus erat, ante me factus est* and *et prior me erat*). In them he repeats Cyril's explanation with approval and rejects as not being sufficiently accommodated to the context Chrysostom's interpretation (*Hom in Joannem* 13.2–3), which says that the priority meant refers to the eternal existence of the divine Son and the future glory of the resurrected Jesus.

87 The same image here in Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 14.1, Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 1 (on 1:16) PG 73 169D, and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 1:16). This sentence begins the paraphrase on 1:16–18, a passage that Erasmus treats as part of the witness of the Baptist. In doing so he is rejecting a tradition that understands the passage as a comment by the Evangelist: Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 14.1, Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 1 (on 1:16) PG 73 169C, the *Gloss* and Nicholas of Lyra (on 1:16) 188v, and Hugh of St Cher (on 1:16) 285v. Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 1:16), cited in support by Erasmus in the annotation on 1:16 (*de plenitudine eius accepimus omnes gratiam pro gratia*), attributes the words to the Baptist, as does the Origen cited by Nicholas and Thomas Aquinas *Catena aurea* 1.17 (on 1:16–17).

88 The same three debts to the grace given through the old law are mentioned by Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 1 (on 1:16–17) PG 73 173C–D.

89 The exposition of the phrase 'grace for grace' in 1:16 as meaning that the old grace of the law is replaced by the gospel grace of forgiveness follows that of Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 14.1–3, Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 1 (on 1:16–17) PG 73 173B–D, and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 1:16), but not that of Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 3.8–10, for whom the one grace is immortal life and the other faith.

90 The presentation of the role of the law follows that of the Greek Fathers cited

in the preceding note and of Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 3.2; it is essentially the Pauline view of eg Rom 2–3, 7.7–25. Cf the *Paraphrase on Romans* on those passages.

91 Cf Ps 82:6, John 10:34–5, and 1 John 3:1–2; making mankind into gods is a frequently repeated theme of Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 1 (on 1:1–18) PG 73 32D–176C.

92 The incompleteness of all earlier visions of God, with examples from the Old Testament, is discussed extensively by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 15.1–2, Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 1 (on 1:18) PG 73 176C, Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 1:18), and more briefly by Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 3.17.

26

93 For the strong statement of revelation here, cf the annotation on 1:18 (*ipse enarravit*), where Erasmus points out Chrysostom's comment (*Hom in Joannem* 15.2) that the verb used in 1:18, ἐξηγήσατο 'explained,' refers to the fuller revelation of divine teaching given by Jesus.

94 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 16.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 1:19, 20) similarly portray the Baptist as the perfect servant and the Jews as inclined to favour him, for the reasons Erasmus goes on to enumerate: his social position equivalent to their own, the sanctity of his life, and their expectation of being able to use him against the insignificant Jesus.

95 Anticipating 1:21 and the paraphrase on it, just below

96 'Would rebuke him and take away' translates Erasmus' intention, not his actual syntax, for he makes a mistake in the mood and tense of the two verbs for 'rebuke' and 'take away,' saying 'would have rebuked' and 'taken away.' The mistake might be put down to Renaissance colloquialism if it were not that three sentences later ('Some even hoped that John …') he writes a parallel syntactical formulation with his usual correctness.

97 Cf 1 Cor 1:20.

98 For the Jews' hope of getting the Baptist to succumb to the temptation of the title of messiah, cf Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 16.2.

27

99 The one tack is declaring that he was not the messiah, and the other is pointing out who was.

100 Mal 4:5–6. For the story of the rapture of Elijah the Tishbite see 2 Kings 2:11.

101 Cf Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 4.5–6, where Augustine explains the apparent contradiction between Jesus' assertion that the Baptist is Elijah (Matt 11:14 and 17:10–13) and this passage. According to Augustine, Elijah himself will reappear at the second coming of Christ, but the Baptist appears in the spirit of Elijah, as forerunner of Christ's human life and death.

102 Erasmus combines two traditions here. 'The prophet' of 1:21 was generally understood to be the one mentioned by Moses in Deut 18:15–18; so eg in Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 16.2, Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 1 (on 1:21) PG 73 184C–D, Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 1:21–3), followed by Hugh of St Cher (on 1:21) 286r and Nicholas of Lyra (on 1:21) 189r. In the annotation on 1:25 (*si tu non es Christus neque Helias neque propheta*) Erasmus had thought only of the prophet of Deut 18. But the interlinear *Gloss* (on 1:21) 189r says

that 'the prophet' is Elisha, an explanation that Hugh attributes to 'the Latins' generally. Erasmus does not mention Elisha specifically but offers the possibility that 'some one of the prophets' is meant, perhaps thinking also of the popular assumptions made about Jesus himself, that he was 'one of the prophets' (Matt 16:14, Mark 8:28, Luke 9:19).

28

103 Isa 40:3; cf the paraphrase on 1:6–7 and 15.

104 In the annotation on 1:23 (*dirigite viam Domini*) Erasmus explains why the Baptist says only 'make straight' here where the other Evangelists had said 'prepare': 'He bids them clear away the roadblocks of evil desires, which make it impossible to see Christ coming.' The paraphrase includes this interpretation and also incorporates the 'prepare' that is otherwise missing in this Gospel but included in the synoptic versions (Matt 3:3, Mark 1:3, Luke 3:4).

105 Cf Acts 23:6–8.

29

106 The gentleness of the Baptist's response is also noted by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 16.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 1:26, 27).

107 In this sentence Erasmus offers two interpretations of 'he is standing in your midst.' One is that Jesus is in the crowd when the interrogation of the Baptist takes place; so Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 16.3 and the interlinear *Gloss* (on 1:26) 189v. The other is the more general statement that he now dwells incarnate on earth; so Hugh of St Cher (on 1:26) 286v and Nicholas of Lyra (on 1:26) 189v. The first interpretation is used again in the paraphrase on 1:28–9. *Iam nunc adstat* 'is now standing' is an emphatic expression in present time for the Vulgate's perfect tense *stetit* 'has been standing.' Erasmus defends the present tense in the annotation on 1:26 (*medius autem vestrum stetit*).

108 That putting on and taking off shoes is the duty of the most menial of slaves is noted here by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 16.3, Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 1 (on 1:26–7) PG 73 188C, and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 1:26, 27).

109 In the annotation on 1:28 (*haec in Bethania facta sunt*) Erasmus cites Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 17.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 1:28) as saying that the better manuscripts have Bethabara here, and also mentions the similar correction of the tenth-century lexicon known as the Suda (*Suidae Lexicon* ed Ada Adler [1928; repr 1971] B252). The *Gloss* and Nicholas of Lyra (on 1:28) 189v supposed that there were two Bethanies, this one and the one in John 11 and 12. Modern texts retain the reading 'Bethany'; see Nestle-Aland 26th ed and Brown AB *John* on the passage.

110 Added from Matt 3:5–6, Mark 1:5, Luke 3:7

30

111 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 17.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 1:29) say that Jesus returns to the Baptist after his baptism to dispel the idea that he had come in need of being washed clean of sin. Erasmus' 'or instructed' in this sentence was added in the 1534 edition.

112 The exemplary classical precedent for the manifestation of divinity is Virgil

Aeneid 1.402–5, where the goddess Venus, disguised as a Carthaginian hunting girl, concludes a conversation with her mortal son Aeneas and takes on her immortal appearance as she turns away: *et vera incessu patuit dea* 'and showed her true godhood in her bearing.' Erasmus says here of Jesus that *ipso incessu totoque corporis habitu semet exserebat* 'he revealed himself by his very bearing and carriage.' The ancients believed conversely that moral turpitude was also revealed by physical appearance. The Roman historian Sallust describes the aristocratic revolutionary Catiline as having a pale complexion, bloodshot eyes, and an erratic gait, and concludes, 'In short, his madness was evident in his face and expression' (*Bellum Catilinae* 15.5).

113 Isa 53:7, a passage cited here by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 17.1, Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 1:29) PG 73 192B, and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 1:29). Erasmus mentions Chrysostom's citation of Isaiah in the annotation on 1:29 (*agnus Dei*). Chrysostom and Cyril both connect the Isaiah passage with the lamb of the first Passover, Exod 12:1–28, as Erasmus does also in the next sentence.

114 Cf 1 John 2:2.

115 In this section Erasmus maintains references to 'sins' in the plural, like the contemporary Vulgate's 1:29 'the sins of the world.' However, in the annotation on 1:29 (*peccata mundi*) he had pointed out that the Greek text uses a collective singular 'sin' and had argued for the singular as more meaningful.

116 Cf Isa 53:4–8. Perhaps on the basis of that passage a double interpretation arose of the verbal form *αἴρων/tollit* in 1:29, that it means 'takes away' and also 'takes upon himself,' as Erasmus pointed out in the annotation on 1:29 (*peccata mundi*). The second alternative is proposed by Hugh of St Cher (on 1:29) 286v (who also quotes 1 John 2:2 here; cf n114). Erasmus incorporates both interpretations into the paraphrase, beginning at 'he himself is so innocent.'

117 Here on 1:31 and in the paraphrase on the two following verses Erasmus has the Baptist say in various ways that while he knew that he was the forerunner of the messiah and that the messiah was then on earth, he had no way of recognizing Jesus as that messiah until the sign of the dove was given – the corollary implication being that he did know his cousin Jesus as one knows any member of his own family. All of this is directed at a famous problem, how the Baptist can say in 1:31 and 33 that he 'did not know him,' when in Matt 3:14 he clearly knew Jesus' identity. Erasmus has an extremely long note on the issue in the annotation on 1:31 (*ego nesciebam eum*), in which he reports and dismisses what he calls Augustine's tortured efforts to find consistency in the two passages (*Tract in Joannem* 4.15–16, 5.2–8) and Chrysostom's less strained but still unsatisfying solution (*Hom in Joannem* 17.3). He goes on to say, 'It is not for this undertaking or for my meagre talents to unravel knots of this kind. But it is only right to advise the reader to consider whether it is not simpler to say that in the divine scheme of things Christ became known to John by degrees, so that his witness for Christ would be surer and better founded. Likewise he allowed the apostles to believe hesitantly so that they would more surely establish our faith in things that they themselves had not recklessly believed.' The paraphrase here demonstrates the same solution. Such gradualism is a consistent and

pronounced feature of Jesus' pedagogical methods as they are presented throughout the paraphrase. Cf also n119.

31

118 Added from Matt 3:2

119 Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 1:31, 33), after proposing in summary form Chrysostom's solution to the problem of the inconsistency between 1:31 and 33 and Matt 3:14, then offers a second possibility: 'We can say that he [the Baptist] did know that he [Jesus] was the messiah and that he [the Baptist] only learned that he [Jesus] was the one who would baptize in the Holy Spirit when he saw the Spirit descend.' This is not far from Erasmus' own theory of the gradual revelation to the Baptist; cf n117.

32

120 The following 'mystical' interpretation of the Baptist's standing still while Jesus walks about is also found in a fragment of Alcuin quoted by Thomas Aquinas in *Catena aurea* 1.23 (on 1:34–6): 'And John is standing in a mystical sense: the law stops and Jesus comes, that is, the grace of the gospel, to which the law itself bears witness. Jesus walks about to collect disciples.' The note is substantially repeated in the *Gloss* (on 1:35) 190r.

121 'To its furthest limit': *ad summam lineam*; cf the rare metaphorical use of *linea* (usually a string, cord, or line in various mechanical or technical applications) found in Horace *Epistles* 1.16.79: *mors ultima linea rerum est* 'death is the last limit of everything.'

122 The bridegroom imagery anticipates 3:29. A similar anticipation of the same imagery is found in treatments of the present passage by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 18.1–2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 1:35–7).

123 Erasmus points out in the annotation on 1:36 (*et respiciens Iesum*) that the Vulgate translator has irrationally chosen *respiciens* 'looking backwards' in this verse to translate the same Greek word that he translates more correctly in 1:42 with *intuitus* 'looking at.' In the paraphrase here Erasmus follows his own suggestion, using *intuitus esset* 'looked at' here and *intuitus* below.

33

124 Cf Rom 1:17 and the *Paraphrase on Romans* on that verse.

125 The same reason, faith in their teacher's words, for the Baptist's disciples' leaving him and going over to Jesus is given by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 18.3 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 1:35–7), both of whom also mention the disciples' diffidence and respectful silence in approaching Jesus.

126 'Syrian' is Erasmus' regular term for Aramaic. The identification of 'rabbi' as a Syrian word is found in Jerome *De nominibus hebraicis* CCL 72 138.

127 Jesus' foreknowledge of what the two disciples want, his questioning them to put them at ease, and their desire, revealed in their question to him, for the greater freedom of a private talk are all noted by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 18.3, Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 1:38) PG 73 216D–217A, and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 1:38, 39).

128 Pleading the imminence of nightfall or deferring the visit until the next day are also mentioned by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 18.3 as excuses Jesus

did not use here. Hugh of St Cher (on 1:39) 288r, in reference to the second excuse, quotes Prov 3:28. Erasmus himself had mentioned both excuses in the annotation on 1:39 (*hora autem quasi decima*).

34

129 The importance of seizing the opportunity to communicate the gospel message is pointed out here by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 18.3, Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 1:39) PG 73 217A, and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 1:38, 39).

130 Erasmus speaks here of the gospel teacher's 'abundance' or *copia*, the rhetorical term he uses, as in the title of his work *De copia* (CWE 24), to indicate the fluency or completeness of thought and expression available to the person well educated in language, style, and literature.

131 The 'philosophy of Christ' is a familiar Erasmian motif; he had touched on it in the second paragraph of his 'author's preface' to the *Paraphrase on John*, 14 above. Cf the *Paraclesis* LB VI *3r–*4v and the letter to Paul Volz prefaced to the 1518 edition of the *Enchiridion* (Ep 858 / CWE 66 8–23). 'Philosophy' had already been applied to the teaching in this Gospel by Chrysostom, eg in *Hom in Joannem* 2.2.

132 There is no indication in the New Testament of the relative ages of Andrew and Peter. The usual tradition, represented by the *Gloss* (on 1:40) 190v, says that Andrew was the younger brother.

133 Cf Matt 16:19 (the keys) and John 21:15–17 (the feeding of the sheep).

134 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 19.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 1:40–2) both emphasize Andrew's joy and his eagerness to share with Peter his new treasure.

135 'Anointed one': *unctus*, the Latin for the Hebrew word Latinized as *messias* (Greek 'Christ'). *Unctus* is given both by Jerome *De nominibus hebraicis* CCL 72 142 and here by Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 7.13.

136 Ps 110:4, Heb 5:6 and 10, 6:20, and Heb 7

137 Cf Matt 10:16.

138 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 19.1–2, Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 1:42) PG 73 220A–B, and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 1:40–2) all point to Jesus' proof of his divinity here by his knowledge of Peter's name and parentage.

35

139 For the definitions cf Jerome *De nominibus hebraicis* CCL 72 135, 136, 140 (for Jonah and John) and 141 (for Simeon). Jerome gives 'dove' as the meaning for Jonah and 'grace' as the meaning for John; 'obedient' is one of his definitions of Simeon, which he distinguishes from Simon. The *Gloss* (on 1:42) 190v says 'For Simon is the obedient son of grace, or, of the dove.' Nicholas of Lyra (on 1:42) 190v says that either Jonah and John are the same name or Peter's father had two names. Erasmus had noted in the annotation on 1:42 (*tu es filius Ioanna*) that 'son of John' and 'son of Jonah' were both Greek attempts to express Barjonah of Matt 16:17; cf Isidore of Seville *Etymologiae* 7.9.4–5. Erasmus used the spelling Simon in this definition in the first three editions of the *Paraphrase on John*, changing to Simeon in 1535.

140 'Rock': *saxum*, the translation of the Greek πέτρος, Latinized as 'Petrus'

141 For the allusion to Peter and the foundation of the church cf Matt 16:18. Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 19.1 and Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 1:42) PG 73 220A–B had both made reference to the Matthew passage here. 'School' is *schola*, the word more regularly used of the adherents of a defined set of principles (eg the Stoic school), not of instructional institutions as such; cf 'philosophy of Christ' in the paraphrase on 1:39 above, and n131.

142 For the despised position of Galilee and the Galileans, cf the paraphrase on 7:41–2. Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 20.1 also underlines here the surprising fact of Jesus' taking disciples from such a place.

143 Isa 9:1–2, quoted in Matt 4:15–16

144 This detail, as Erasmus mentions in the annotation on 1:43 (*a Bethsaida civitate*), is from Jerome *De locis hebraicis* PL 23 884C.

145 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 20.1 suggests that Philip had heard about Jesus from Peter or from the Evangelist (presumed to be the unnamed companion of Andrew in 1:35–40); Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 1:43–5) proposes Peter and Andrew as the sources.

146 'Found': *repperisset*. Erasmus had said in the annotation on 1:45 (*invenit Philippus Nathanael*) that *reperire* 'find what one is looking for' was a better choice of word than the Vulgate's *invenire* 'come upon by chance,' and so chooses it in the paraphrase on the verse.

147 The addition in the paraphrase of 'true' to the Gospel's 'the messiah' seems intended to reflect the view of Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 19.1, reported by Erasmus in the annotation on 1:45 (*invenit Philippus Nathanael*), that the presence of the article with 'messiah' in the Gospel text is meant to indicate the particular messiah promised to the Jews and awaited by them, not 'messiah' or 'anointed one' as any king's title. For Moses' prophecy see Deut 18:15–18.

36

148 Cf Matt 2:23, Luke 2:51. The same explanation of Jesus' supposed origin in Nazareth is given here by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 20.1, Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 1:45) PG 73 220D, and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 1:43–5).

149 Mic 5:2, quoted here as the reason for Nathanael's hesitation by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 20.1 and Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 1:45) PG 73 220D–221A.

150 Erasmus' portrayal of Nathanael's reaction, eager but hesitating, and his paraphrase on Nathanael's response as expressing a prudent doubt, follow Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 20.1–2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 1:46–8); this interpretation is one of the two possibilities raised by Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 7.15–17, who says that Nathanael's remark could also be a statement, not a question, dismissive of what Philip had said. Erasmus had already declared his preference for Chrysostom's interpretation in the annotation on 1:46 (*a Nazareth potest aliquid*).

151 Cf the language of Hugh of St Cher (on 1:46) 289r: 'For the uneducated Philip, not knowing how to answer or caring much about the answer to the question put to him, sent him to the source of wisdom, that is, Jesus.'

152 That omniscience serves the same function as miracles here, to prove Jesus' divine power (as it had in the meeting with Peter), is also the assertion of

Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 20.2, Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 1:47) PG 73 221C, and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 1:46–8).

153 For the remark about false Israelites cf the paraphrase on 8:33–48, and on 19:19 and n34. The peculiar combination of past (imperfect) and present tenses, 'boasted' followed by 'are generally over-scrupulous,' is Erasmus' own.

154 Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 7.21 explains that the fig here is an allusion to Gen 3:7; its leaves symbolize the sins with which Adam and Eve covered themselves.

155 Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 1:49) PG 73 224A–B says, quoting Ps 7:9, that Nathanael knows 'only God is a searcher of hearts,' and so he recognizes the divinity of Jesus.

37

156 'Nathanael' in this sentence is the 1524 correction for the mistake 'Philip' in the 1523 edition (so also above, in the paraphrase on 1:47, 'Jesus commended both Nathanael's simple belief …'). The mistake would not be worth mentioning except that it drew the passage to the attention of the Paris theologian Noël Béda, a spokesman for the Catholic conservatives, who found here not a slip of the pen but the heretical idea that Peter and Nathanael were to be equated. Erasmus answered Béda's criticisms in the *Divinationes* LB IX 481F–482B, *Elenchus* LB IX 500B, and *Supputatio* LB IX 624F–625D. He points out that the mistake had been corrected after the first edition, though the criticism is still being repeated; by the time of the *Supputatio* (1527) its repetition leads him to argue that Philip also (in 1:45) had said substantially the same thing as both Peter and Nathanael. More to the point, he asserts that the paraphrase here follows the interpretation of Chrysostom in his *Homilies on Matthew* 55 (54.2), who says that Nathanael did not yet possess the spirit with which Peter later spoke. (Erasmus might also have mentioned that Chrysostom says much the same thing in *Hom in Joannem* 21.1, that Nathanael's understanding here of the extent of Jesus' divinity did not approach that in Peter's later declaration; so also Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* [on 1:49–51], and cf Erasmus' previous sentence.) The mistake in names, with reference also to the equation of Nathanael and Peter, was included again in the *Censurae* on Erasmus' works by the Paris faculty of theology in 1530, and very briefly answered by Erasmus in the *Declarationes ad censuras Lutetiae vulgatas* LB IX 881D, 881F–882A, where he points out a similar careless error in the wording of one of the faculty's censures.

157 Matt 16:18–19

158 Ps 82:6, John 10:34–5

38

159 Angels at Jesus' conception: Luke 1:26–38; at his birth: Luke 2:9–15; appearing to Joseph: Matt 2:19–20; after Jesus' temptation: Matt 4:11; comforting him in Gethsemane: Luke 22:43; at the resurrection: Matt 28:2–7, Mark 16:5–7, Luke 24:4–7, John 20:12–13; at the ascension: Acts 1:10–11. Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 21.1 has a very similar list here of the appearances of angels during Jesus' earthly life.

160 Cf Luke 21:27 (in cloud, with majesty); Matt 16:27 and Mark 8:38 (with his angels); Acts 10:42, 2 Tim 4:1, 1 Pet 4:5 and the Nicene and Apostles' creeds (to judge the living and the dead); 1 Cor 15:24 (to hand over the kingdom to our God and Father).

Chapter 2

1 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 21.1 also says Jesus was better known in Galilee than elsewhere, though not for anything special, and so was invited to the wedding.

2 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 21.2 in his discussion of this episode also alludes to the limited opinions about Jesus held by his relatives.

3 No mention of this family connection is to be found in Chrysostom, Cyril, Augustine, or Theophylact. But Nicholas of Lyra (on 2:1–2) 192r reports a common story that the wedding in question is that of John the Evangelist himself (and that Jesus called him from the wedding to discipleship), and that Mary was there because the Evangelist was her nephew. Hugh of St Cher (on 2:1) 290r–v finds the story improbable and merely says that 'one of the couple may have been related to Mary.'

4 'Had grown quite lively': *incaluisset,* literally 'had grown warm.' The verb is used in Livy (1.57.8, 39.42.10) and Tacitus (*Histories* 4.29.1, *Annals* 11.37.2 and 14.2.1) of the effect of wine at banquets and drinking-parties, and also in the Vulgate version of Esther 7:2. Erasmus will use it again metaphorically in the paraphrase on 2:10 below (cf n23).

5 According to Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 21.2, the known 'indications' are the scriptural ones of the nativity accounts and the visit to the temple in Luke 2:41–51, as well as the testimony of the Baptist, though he allows that there may have been other miracles done elsewhere.

6 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 21.2–3 and 22.1 similarly argues that Jesus must make clear the separation of his mother's and relatives' desires from the divine motivation for his action. See also Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 8.5–9: Mary is mother only of his human self. Erasmus had to insist on the points made here in defence of his treatment of Mary; see n7 below.

39

7 This passage came in for criticism from the Catholic conservatives, in the persons of Noël Béda and the Paris faculty of theology, for what they regarded as a devaluation of the Virgin Mary and her cult in contemporary practice. Erasmus replied to Béda's objections in the *Divinationes* LB IX 482B–D, *Elenchus* LB IX 500B, and at greatest length in the *Supputatio* LB IX 625D–629E, and to the Paris theologians in *Declarationes ad censuras Lutetiae vulgatas* LB IX 914F–915A. His defence in its various forms covers the same ground as the *Paraphrase on John,* and elaborates as well some assumptions that underlie the *Paraphrases,* in particular that the disputed passage must be understood in the context of the narrative and the points being made in it, not extracted for universal application (cf also the *Ratio verae theologiae* LB V 85E–F), and that the views expressed here are those of the oldest and best

Doctors: Luke, Paul, Chrysostom, and Augustine (cf n6). For Erasmus' mariology, see L.-E. Halkin's introduction to the *Virginis Mariae apud Lauretum cultae liturgia* ASD V-1 89–92, and John O'Malley's introduction to the selection of Erasmus' spiritualia in CWE 66 xxxv.

8 Cf Luke 2:41–52.

9 Cf Matt 12:46–50, Mark 3:31–5, Luke 8:19–21. Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 21.2 cites this incident in discussing Jesus' rebuke to his mother.

10 The same observation is found in Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 22.1, and in Hugh of St Cher (on 2:5) 291r: 'not disturbed or angered by her son's reply, but trusting in his power and piety.'

11 On the role of human need as a primary motivation for the miracles, cf Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 21.2–3, and the paraphrases on 2:19 below and on 15:24.

12 On the aridity of Palestine and the scarcity of streams and springs, cf Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 22.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 2:5–8).

13 Cf Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 22.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 2:5–8).

14 'Measures': *cados*, which Erasmus has substituted for the Vulgate *metretas*; he points out in the annotation on 2:6 (*metretas duas*), citing Guillaume Budé *De asse* 5 (*Opera omnia* [Basel 1557] II 222), that the two words are both Greek and mean the same thing, but that Latin regularly uses *cadus*, meaning a measure of ten *congii*. The *congius* is approximately equivalent to 3.2 litres; OCD sv 'Measures.'

15 Erasmus incorporates into the paraphrase the explanation of the term *architriclinus* 'steward' that he gave in the annotation on 2:8 (*architriclinus*).

16 This reason for taking the wine to the steward is in Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 22.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 2:5–8), but the next reason, his trained palate, is not.

40

17 'Leaked out': *dimanavit*, 'leaked,' 'trickled,' 'seeped'; the choice of word is a subtle touch, given the topic.

18 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 22.2 uses the same turn of phrase: 'not just wine but the finest wine.'

19 The gradual revelation of Christ in the miracles and teaching is noted here also by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 22.2 and 23.1. Cf chapter 1 above nn40, 81, 117.

20 The rhetorical-dramatic concept of types and signs as rehearsals for the performance of salvation is common in the *Paraphrase on John*; here it is moved one step back, to a rehearsal of other rehearsals. For a similar but more allegorized treatment by Erasmus of the significance of this miracle, see lines 261–324 of the sermon on John 2:1–11 that he wrote in 1525 for his *Virginis Matris apud Lauretum cultae liturgia* ASD V-1 99–107.

21 For the 'honourable marriage and unstained marriage-bed' cf Heb 13:4, similarly alluded to by Bede as cited in the *Catena aurea* 2.1 (on 2:1–4), where Bede singles out the followers of Tatian and Marcion for their anti-matrimonial views. Cf also Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 9.2, Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 2:11–13) PG 73 228B. Erasmus' opposition to those who derogate Christian marriage is well known; see eg his *Encomium matrimonii*, *Institutio christiani*

matrimonii, the colloquy *Virgo μισόγαμος* 'The Girl with No Interest in Marriage,' with the introduction to it in Thompson *Colloquies*, and John O'Malley's introduction to the selection of spiritualia in CWE 66 xxxiii–xxxv.

22 Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 9.3–5 compares Old Testament prophecy to water and its change into, not replacement by, the wine of the gospel. Similarly Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 2:9, 10). Spiritual inebriation in a good sense is also found in Scripture; eg Ps 23:5 (Vulgate text), 36:8; Song of Sol 5:1; Zech 9:15. For the theme in Erasmus' thought, see M.A. Screech *Ecstasy and the Praise of Folly* (London: Duckworth 1980) 72–5, and the paraphrase on Acts 2:13.

23 'Grow blessedly warm': *feliciter ... incalescunt*; cf n4 above.

24 This passage was criticized as Lutheranizing by Noël Béda because it allegedly denied the latent presence of Christ in the Old Testament and the necessity for good works in addition to faith to assure salvation; Erasmus answered the charges in the *Elenchus* LB IX 500B–E and *Supputatio* LB IX 629E–630B.

25 The church as bride is Paul's image; 2 Cor 11:2, Eph 5:22–32. Augustine had introduced the image into his treatment of this episode, *Tract in Joannem* 8.4; it is a commonplace thereafter.

26 Cf Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 9.10 and the interlinear *Gloss* (on 2:2) 192r.

41

27 This interpretation of 'Cana of Galilee' is a deduction from the meanings given for 'Cana' and 'Galilee' in Jerome *De nominibus hebraicis* CCL 72 140, 142. The interpretation was offered already in Hugh of St Cher (on 2:1) 290r and the *Gloss* (on 2:1) 192r–v. The *Gloss* adds that the wedding was in a town of that name because 'those people are worthy of Christ who out of the fervour of their devotion migrate from vice to virtue, from earth to heaven'; cf Erasmus' next sentence.

28 Cf Isa 9:1, Matt 4:13–15 for the geographical information and (with 1 Macc 5:15) for the expression 'Galilee of the peoples'; for the application to Capernaum of being raised in the world and cast down before God, cf Matt 11:23, Luke 10:15, a passage also quoted here by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 23.1.

29 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 23.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 2:12–17) say that Jesus is getting his mother settled in Capernaum so she does not have to accompany him in his wanderings, a further detail in the theme of his independence of human authority for his actions.

30 For the explanation of Pascha cf Jerome *De nominibus hebraicis* CCL 72 148. The punning connection of Passover/pass over with Christian redemption is made here in the *Gloss* (on 2:13) 193r: 'We keep Pascha when we pass over from vice to virtue.' Cf the paraphrase on 6:4 and n8, and on 13:1 n1.

31 Together with all his usual sources, Erasmus combines the two themes of dishonesty and commercialization in his treatment of this account, though he does not, as they do, here raise the question of whether there were one or two cleansings, this one and the one told in the synoptics (Matt 21:12–13, Mark 11:15–17, Luke 19:45–6).

42

32 The only source for this particular form of double-dealing seems to be Bede as cited in the *Catena aurea* 2.4 (on 2:14–17).

33 'Money-changers or bankers': *numularii sive collybistae.* Erasmus adds the Latinized version, *collybistae,* of the word used in the Greek text. Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 2:12–17) explains that κολλυβισταί are those who make change, called *nummi* by the Romans, for larger coins. Evasion in these various transactions of the Mosaic laws forbidding usury is described by Hugh of St Cher (on 2:14) 292r and Nicholas of Lyra (on 2:14) 193r.

34 The Vulgate says 'as it were a whip,' *quasi flagellum.* In the annotation on 2:15 (*et cum fecisset quasi flagellum*) Erasmus remarks that the Greek text has no qualifier with 'whip'; he accordingly omits it here.

35 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 23.3 also explains that the answer was ambiguous because of the hearers' hardness of heart and inability to understand.

43

36 Cf Matt 12:39–41, 16:4; Luke 11:29–32. The sign is also identified as that of Jonah by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 23.3 (who quotes Matt 12:39), Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 2:19) PG 73 233D (who quotes Matt 16:4–5), and Hugh of St Cher (on 2:19) 293v.

37 As Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 23.3, Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 2:18–22) (in much more detail than Chrysostom), and Nicholas of Lyra (on 2:20) 193v explain, this is the later temple, reconstructed after the return from exile. In the annotation on 2:20 (*quadraginta sex annis*) Erasmus takes the opportunity to dismiss with scorn such allegorical interpretations as that given for the number forty-six by Augustine on this passage, *Tract in Joannem* 10.11–12.

38 The seed is a favourite image of Chrysostom (see *Hom in Joannem* 13, 18, as well as 24.1 on this passage, and elsewhere), as of Erasmus.

39 This conceit (which incidentally contradicts Erasmus' historical view of the date of the temple referred to in 2:20; see n37 above) may have been stimulated by the comments in the *Gloss* (on 2:20) 193v: 'For the body of Christ, organized in his mother's womb, like that of any man, in forty-six days but destroyed by the Jews, was raised on the third day after death' and Hugh of St Cher (on 2:21) 294r: 'The comparison, according to the *Gloss,* is taken from the construction of the temple because like the forty-six years for the temple, the body of Christ was, I would not say organized, but brought along from the tiny parts that it had in the instant of conception to a noticeable mass.'

40 Eg 1 Kings 17:17–24, 2 Kings 4:18–37, Matt 9:18–26, Mark 5:22–43, Luke 8:41–56, Luke 7:11–16, John 11, Acts 20:9–12.

44

41 Cf 1 Cor 1:22.

42 Like Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 23.3 and Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 2:24) PG 73 240A–B, Erasmus takes the occasion offered by the closing verses of this chapter to expatiate on the theme of Jesus' pedagogical methods, especially the gradual introduction of his followers to the mysteries of faith, and his role as a model teacher for the church.

Chapter 3

1 Fear and weakness are the traits of Nicodemus pointed out by Chrysostom

Hom in Joannem 24.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 3:1). Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 3:1) PG 73 241A–B mentions his concern for his position and his embarrassment at the thought of being found out by the other Jews.

45

2 For the right of first seat in the synagogue cf Matt 23:6. Nicodemus' fear of being banned from the synagogue (with reference to 9:22) is mentioned here by Hugh of St Cher (on 3:2) 294v and Nicholas of Lyra (on 3:2) 194v.

3 Cf Isa 42:3 and Matt 12:20, also quoted here by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 24.1, who similarly points out the gentleness of Jesus' treatment of Nicodemus; likewise Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 3:2). Hugh of St Cher (on 3:5) 295v cites Chrysostom and the Isaiah passage.

4 'Appealed to his listener's good will': *captat benevolentiam Iesu.* Erasmus uses the terminology of classical rhetoric, in which *captare benevolentiam* describes the function of the opening of a formal speech – and by extension the opening of any effort at verbal persuasion. Cf Cicero *De inventione* 1.20–2.

5 'The case speaks for itself': *res ipsa loquitur.* In his discussion of *Adagia* III iv 49: *Res indicabit* 'The result will show [the truth of what is said]' Erasmus includes this expression as being closely allied. He cites Lucian *Toxaris* (which he had translated into Latin) and Aristophanes *Wasps* (921), and might have added Cicero *Pro Milone* 53. The expression recurs several times in the *Paraphrase on John.*

6 The inadequacy of Nicodemus' understanding of Jesus here is noted by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 24.2 and Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 3:2) PG 73 241C.

7 Jesus' pedagogical methods – gentle treatment of what might have been regarded as insulting remarks, gradual leading into the mysteries, moderating his replies to the hearer's level of understanding, and the use of deliberately puzzling ideas to engage the hearer and challenge him into further inquiry – are noted by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 24.2 and Hugh of St Cher (on 3:3) 295v (who cites Chrysostom); see n3 above, and the paraphrase on 2:24 and n42.

8 Water and wine are the leading images of 2:1–11; see the paraphrase on 2:11 and n22.

9 Introduced from Matt 3:11 and Luke 3:16; fire is not a part of this Evangelist's references to baptism.

10 Cf 1 Kings 18:21, a passage also alluded to here by Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 3:1) PG 73 241B. Erasmus had elaborated the same expression in the *Enchiridion* CWE 66 50.

11 Introduced from Mark 8:38, Luke 9:26

12 'Reborn anew': *denuo ... renascatur,* the same words as in the Vulgate, though Erasmus reports in the annotation on 3:3 (*nisi quis renatus*) that some old Latin manuscripts use the simple verb *nasci* 'be born' instead of *renasci* 'be reborn.' On *denuo* 'anew' see n14 below.

13 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 24.3 and Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 3:4) PG 73 244A and (on 3:5) PG 73 244C also point out the foolishness and stupidity of Nicodemus. Nicholas of Lyra (on 3:11) 195r calls him a slow learner.

46

14 'Again, or from above': *denuo, sive e supernis.* Apart from the present sentence,

in this episode Erasmus consistently views spiritual birth as being second birth. In the annotation on 3:7 (*et nasci denuo*) he notes that the Greek word translated by *denuo* is *ἄνωθεν* and reports Chrysostom's observation (*Hom in Joannem* 24.2) that it can mean either 'again' or 'from above.' The second meaning, Erasmus says, is clearly the one meant at 19:11, 'You would have no power over me if it were not given you from above.' He adds that Cyril (*Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 3:3) PG 73 241D and (on 3:5) PG 73 244C) uses the word in this second sense, and that Origen in his *Commentary on Romans* 5.8 (on Rom 6:3–4) PG 14 1038A–B also notes the double meaning, with extra material by Origen's Latin translator added for the benefit of the Latin reader. In the paraphrase on 4:10, however, where he refers to this episode again, Erasmus speaks of rebirth 'from above' (*e supernis*). Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 3:3) seems to prefer 'from above,' though he notes that Nicodemus only understands 'again,' *Enarr in Joannem* (on 3:4, 5). Hugh of St Cher (on 3:3) 295r summarizes Chrysostom on the two meanings of *ἄνωθεν* and says that *denuo* only covers one of them.

15 Transformation is also a theme of Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 3:5) PG 73 244C and (on 3:6) PG 73 245A.

16 Certainly proverbial in meaning, though not included in this form in the *Adagia*; but see *Adagia* IV iii 36: *Patris est filius* 'He's his father's son' and Ezek 16:44; Petronius *Satyricon* 45: *Colubra restem non parit* 'It's not a rope that the snake bears.'

17 Cf Matt 26:41.

18 Cf the preface to this *Paraphrase* in chapter 1, on metaphors and their use in understanding divine matters, 13 and 15 above. Cyril also comments on the usefulness of comparisons, but not at this point in the chapter, *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 3:27) PG 73 264A. In the annotation on 3:8 (*spiritus ubi vult spirat*) Erasmus is at pains to explain that this passage contains a metaphor, citing Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 26.1–2 and Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 3:7–8) PG 73 245C–D. He explains that *spiritus* here means the blowing of air on earth; the next sentence of the paraphrase makes use of the same explanation.

19 Cf 4:24.

20 'Spirit': *spiritus;* the Latin word means 'wind,' 'air,' 'breath.'

21 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 26.1–2 says that the wind does not have free will, it merely cannot be controlled by human will.

22 'Wherever': *quo*. The Vulgate has *ubi*, which could mean 'where' or 'when.' In the annotation on 3:8 (*spiritus ubi vult spirat*) Erasmus follows Valla's *Annotationes* (841) in preferring the more precise *quo* here.

47

23 The superiority of faith to reason as a means of comprehending the divine is dealt with in connection with this episode by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 24.3, 25.1, 26.1–2, and Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 3:11) PG 73 248C.

24 For the contrast of wise and humble, cf Matt 11:25 and Luke 10:21; for the wisdom of this age, 1 Cor 1:20.

25 Even though in the annotation on 3:10 (*tu es magister in Israel*) Erasmus argued that the presence of the article with 'teacher' in the Greek text means '*the* teacher,' the one whose reputation is well known, he chooses not to make the point here.

26 Erasmus here interrupts what is in the Gospel text Jesus' unbroken speech, summarizing his preceding remarks and introducing the next section of the speech. At the same point Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 27.1 remarks on Jesus' consideration for the limited capacities of his hearers and his reluctance to overwhelm them with lofty themes, as here, the sublimity of the mystery of his own person.

48

27 English 'you' and 'your' obscures the difference, but as in the Gospel text here, Erasmus uses plural pronominal forms throughout the paraphrase of 3:12.

28 'How would you believe me?' translates Erasmus' potential expression *quomodo credituri sitis*, with which he paraphrases the Vulgate's *quomodo credetis* 'how will you believe me?' He says in the annotation on 3:12 (*si terrena dixi vobis et non creditis*) that his corrected Greek manuscripts read *πιστεύσητε*, the Greek potential subjunctive.

29 The paraphrase 'has ever been great enough to ascend' makes clear that the Vulgate *ascendit* translates a Greek past tense, not present (the two tenses of this word in Latin are identical in form), a point which Erasmus made in the annotation on 3:13 (*et nemo ascendit in coelum*). The verb in Erasmus' next sentence then must also be taken as past, 'has ascended,' though to a traditionalist reader of the Latin original it could have been present.

30 A similar emphasis, enlarging on 3:13 'who is in heaven,' on the continuing presence of the Son with the Father even during his earthly existence, is found in Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 3:13); Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 27.1 has one sentence on the point.

31 Erasmus here gives his first paraphrase of 3:16, making it precede that of 3:14–15 and be part of Jesus' own words; he will give another version below, in the sentence beginning 'For who was going to believe.' The second version, however, he clearly means to be understood as the words of the Evangelist. See n35 below.

32 Cf 11:50–2.

33 Erasmus' usual sources agree in seeing an analogy being made here between the poison of the desert serpents and the poison of sin: Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 27.2, Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 3:14, 15) PG 73 252B–C, Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 12.11, Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 3:14–15). Cyril, however, adds an allusion to Rom 8:3, on the word of God in the likeness of sinful flesh, which may underlie Erasmus' description of the serpent 'which had the appearance of a poisonous beast but was so far without poison that it even set free others.'

49

34 Cf Matt 13.1–23, Mark 4:1–20, Luke 8:4–15, and the paraphrase on 2:21–2 and n38 above.

35 A second paraphrase of 3:16; see above, n31. Erasmus presents the paraphrase of 3:17–21, together with this version of 3:16, as the words of the Evangelist, not of Jesus. In doing so he rejects the positions of Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 27, Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 3:17) PG 73 255C–256C, Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 12.12, Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 3:18–21),

and the *Catena aurea* 3.6–7 (on 3:16–21), all of whom take it for granted that Jesus is still the speaker, as apparently do the *Gloss*, Hugh of St Cher, and Nicholas of Lyra. But some modern scholars also think that Jesus may not be the speaker; see Brown AB *John* 136 and 149, and the literature cited there. In the 1527 annotation on 3:16 (*sic enim deus dilexit mundum*) Erasmus inserts this note: 'From this point the words could clearly be the Evangelist's, continuing and explicating the conversation that Jesus has begun with Nicodemus'; he goes on to give parallel examples where he says a New Testament writer abandons his narrative to insert comment of his own.

36 Reference to the second coming as well as to the first is made in the treatment of this passage by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 28.1, Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 3:15–17), the *Gloss* (on 3:17) 196r, Nicholas of Lyra (on 3:17) 195v, and Hugh of St Cher (on 3:17) 298v.

37 The paraphrase of 3:17–18 was criticized by Noël Béda as Lutheranizing, on the grounds that it required only faith for salvation. Erasmus' replies insist that the passage speaks only of the futility of works before baptism and that it goes on to require right living of those already baptized: *Divinationes* LB IX 482D–E, *Elenchus* LB IX 500E–F, *Supputatio* LB IX 630B–D.

38 Erasmus refers specifically to Jewish practices here; Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 3:17) PG 73 256A remarks that one explanation for 3:17 is that Jesus is telling Nicodemus that the new life is not as harsh as the old Mosaic law.

39 A theme of this Gospel; see 1:9, 8:12, 9:5. But the equation of truth and light in the next sentence rests on Ps 43:3.

50

40 Erasmus takes *facit veritatem* 'does the truth' of 3:21 in the first instance as 'does good deeds'; so the interlinear *Gloss* (on 3:21) 196r, Hugh of St Cher (on 3:21) 299v, and Nicholas of Lyra (on 3:21) 196r. But in what follows he elaborates more subtly that those who long for God also long for the truth that is the correction of their misdeeds; so Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 12.13, Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 3:21) PG 73 257B–C, the *Gloss* (on 3:21) 196r.

41 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 28.2, in connection with this passage, discusses the unlikely case of sincere philosophers, and the more likely one of philosophers who know their error but persist in it.

42 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 24.1 and Hugh of St Cher (on 3:2) 294v make the same identification of Nicodemus as the later defender of Jesus and assistant at his burial (cf 7:50–2 and 19:39–42), but at the outset of their discussions of chapter 3.

43 Erasmus here stays close to the Vulgate text. In what follows just below, however, he makes it clear, as the Gospel text specifies at 4:2, and as is pointed out here by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 29.1, Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 3:22–4) PG 73 260B, the interlinear *Gloss* (on 3:22) 196r, and Hugh of St Cher (on 3:22) 299v, that Jesus himself does not baptize, the disciples baptize.

44 The *Gloss* (on 3:23) 196r, Hugh of St Cher (on 3:22) 300r, and Nicholas of Lyra (on 3:22) 196r agree that it is Aenon which has a meaning that has something to do with water. Jerome *De nominibus hebraicis* CCL 72 142 says that one meaning of Aenon is 'their fountain,' while one meaning of Salim is 'source of waters.' Erasmus' sentence is so written that the definition he gives appears to belong to Salim.

51

45 Jealousy and envy are generally regarded as the motive for the behaviour of the Baptist's disciples: Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 29.2, Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 3:25–6) PG 73 261A, Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 3:25–7), the *Gloss* and Nicholas of Lyra (on 3:25) 196v, Hugh of St Cher (on 3:25) 300r–v.

46 'People' here apparently accounts for a reference to Jews or a Jew in the text of 3:25. The Vulgate traditionally read the plural 'Jews,' but Greek texts have varied between singular and plural; cf Nestle-Aland 26th ed. The singular was read by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 29.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 3:25–7), though Cyril *Comm in Joannem* (on 3:25–6) PG 73 260C has the plural. The *Gloss*, Hugh of St Cher and Nicholas of Lyra, cited in n45 above, all read the plural and have slightly different ideas about who 'the Jews' in this quarrel were: merely disputants (the *Gloss*), Jews who had received the disciples' baptism (Hugh), or baptized Jews as well as Jesus' disciples themselves (Nicholas). The lack of unanimity in textual and interpretive matters may have persuaded Erasmus to pass over the whole question as quietly as possible.

47 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 29.2 says that the Baptist's disciples purposely omitted in 3:26 to mention John's baptism of Jesus lest they have to recall the voice from heaven and the appearance of the Holy Spirit, and undercut their own case. Erasmus nonetheless includes it.

48 For 'according to my ability' cf 3:34: 'God does not give [the messiah] his Spirit within limits,' and the paraphrase of that verse, below.

49 The addition of fire as an element of baptism is from the synoptics; see the paraphrase on 3:3 and n9 above. Erasmus brings in the fire theme again just below, on 3:30.

50 Cf 1:27. The servant-master theme as an explication of the herald-messiah relationship is used here by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 29.2, Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 3:27) PG 73 264A, and Hugh of St Cher (on 3:28) 301r.

52

51 Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 13.11–12 discusses the treachery of a groomsman who seduces the bride, and also emphasizes the silence of the groomsman in his proper role.

52 For this form of comparison, which emphasizes the unlikeness of the compared elements, cf *De copia* 2 CWE 24 616 (on examples) and 621 (on parallels). For Erasmus' insertion of fire into this Evangelist's treatment of baptism, see nn9 and 49 above. Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 29.1 had discussed the relative efficacies of Jesus' and the Baptist's baptisms.

53 Erasmus here paraphrases the Gospel text as it appears in Greek and in old Latin manuscripts that were available to him; see the annotation on 3:31 (*qui de terra est, de terra loquitur*), where he cites in support Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 30.1, Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 3:32–4), and Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 3:31) PG 73 272A–B, as well as Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 14.6 (though his Augustine text read slightly differently from modern ones). The Vulgate he annotated, instead of reading 'qui de terra est, de terra est,' omitted the second clause as an apparent dittography; modern texts do not.

54 Like Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 30.1, Erasmus draws out the necessary

reliance of the Baptist on human perception as a source of knowledge in order to contrast it with the higher perceptive abilities of Jesus. It is Erasmus, however, who casts the distinction in terms of the senses: smell vs sight and hearing.

55 'As his Father testified in his own voice' was added to the sentence in the edition of 1534.

56 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 30.2 on this passage and Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 3:34) PG 73 277C–D also distinguish the prophets as sent from God in a lesser sense than that in which his incarnate Son was sent.

57 In the annotation on 3:34 (*non enim dat deus ad mensuram spiritum*) Erasmus remarks that *dat ad mensuram* 'gives by the gauge' is proverbial for giving sparingly or moderately. It does not appear in the *Adagia*.

58 See Rom 12:3, Col 2:9. These two passages, with others, are quoted with reference to this passage by Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 74.3 (on 14:15–17).

59 In a 1527 addition to the annotation on 3:34 (*non enim dat deus ad mensuram spiritum*) Erasmus said that 'from this point on the Evangelist seems to have attached his own words to those of the Baptist.' The language of the paraphrase here, however, gives no such indication of a change of speaker as appeared above in the paraphrase on 3:17–21 (see the paraphrase there and n35). For modern hypotheses of a change of speaker in 3:31–6, see Brown *AB John* 159–60.

60 'Into his hands': *in manum*. The Vulgate reading is *in manu*, translating a similar Greek phrase, *ἐν τῇ χειρί*. In the annotation on 3:35 (*et omnia dedit in manu eius*) Erasmus considers whether this expression apparently of location ('in his hand') is to be understood as meaning direction towards, or, by the Hebrew idiom, instrumentality. Citing the preference of 'all the Greek commentators' Erasmus finds the former more appealing; so he paraphrases here. The whole expression in the paraphrase, *tradidit illi in manum* 'has given over into his hands' is paralleled in Livy's history of Rome, 1.54.10 and 26.12.11.

53

61 Drawing out the Gospel's 'will not see life,' Erasmus reintroduces a theme he had emphasized earlier in the chapter; see the paraphrase on 3:19–21 above. It is a recurring motif of this Gospel.

Chapter 4

1 'That envy comes in glory's train': *ut gloriam comitetur invidia;* rather surprisingly not in the *Adagia*, but a familiar idea among classical commonplaces. The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* 4.36 speaks of 'envy the companion of excellence' and Velleius Paterculus 1.9.6 of 'envy, constant companion of eminent good fortune,' but the clearest parallel is in Nepos *Chabrias* 3.3: 'There is this common failing in great and free states, that envy is the companion of glory' (*ut invidia gloriae comes sit*).

2 See 1 Cor 1:17, and for discussions touching on Erasmus' view of the importance of preaching and teaching, Manfred Hoffmann 'Erasmus on Church and Ministry' ERSY 6 (1986) 19–21, and John O'Malley's introduction to the

spiritualia in CWE 66 xxiff and the literature referred to there. This explanation of the meaning of Jesus' refraining from baptizing is apparently Erasmus' own; there is nothing like it in his usual sources. Throughout the episode, even more than ordinarily, Erasmus repeatedly emphasizes Jesus' words and behaviour as models for the methods and manner of life of the Christian teacher, that is, cleric.

3 A similar pair of reasons is in Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 31.1, but only the first in Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 4:1–4).

4 In the annotation on 4:4 (*per mediam Samariam*) Erasmus finds that there is no textual support in Greek or Latin for the Vulgate reading of his day, 'through the midst of Samaria,' and supposes a corruption arising from a scribe's marginal note. Here the paraphrase makes no concession to the Vulgate text but confines itself to the reading Erasmus had defended. The historical excursus on Samaria in the rest of the paragraph is paralleled in Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 31.2, who bases his remarks on 1 Kings 16:24ff, 2 Kings 17, Isa 7:9, Sir 50:25–6, and in Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 4:5, 6).

54

5 Cf 8:48 and the paraphrase on that verse.

6 See Gen 34, cited by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 31.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 4:5, 6).

7 Jesus' weariness and his mode of transportation are pointed out as models for Christian (not clerical) behaviour by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 31.3 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 4:6–8), who also mentions the cool air around the spring.

8 In the annotation on 4:6 (*sedebat sic supra fontem*) Erasmus says that *ad fontem* 'by the spring' is preferable to the Vulgate *supra fontem* 'over the spring' or the *super fontem* 'above the spring' found in some old Latin manucripts. The paraphrase, however, allows for the Vulgate reading while trying to make it intelligible. The end of the sentence is much like one in Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 4:6–8), who says that Jesus did not sit on a seat but took a place 'resting his body on the paving [or, on the ground] and refreshing himself by the spring.'

9 While Chrysostom and Theophylact in the places cited in n7 mention or take it for granted that Jesus is bothered by the heat, Hugh of St Cher (on 4:6) 304r is at pains to make it explicit that he was so 'because at that hour the sun has already climbed to a higher point of our [celestial] hemisphere.'

10 For Jesus' physical experiences as evidence of his true humanity, see the preface to this *Paraphrase* in chapter 1, 14–15 above. The point is strongly made by Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 4:6) PG 73 292C–293C (though Cyril in the next breath denies that Jesus was thirsty; see n14 below) and mentioned by Nicholas of Lyra (on 4:6) 197v–198r.

11 Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 4:7–8) PG 73 296A also says here that Jesus made use of the activity the woman was engaged in to start a conversation, and like Erasmus in *venaretur illam ad salutem* 'head her towards salvation' uses a hunting metaphor to describe Jesus' action. Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 31.4 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 4:6–8) say that Jesus uses his thirst as a starting point for the conversation; similarly, Hugh of St Cher (on 4:7) 304v and (on 4:9) 305r, and Nicholas of Lyra (on 4:9) 198r.

12 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 31.4 gives the same grounds for her deduction, though with some hesitancy; cf also Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 4:9–11) and Nicholas of Lyra (on 4:9) 198r.

13 Cf 8:48 and Luke 10:33–7, referred to by Chrysostom earlier in the discussion of this episode (*Hom in Joannem* 31.2); Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 4:7–8) PG 73 296A–B. 'Shun dealings' translates *abhorrere a commercio*, Erasmus' paraphrase of the Vulgate *non couti;* in the annotation on 4:9 (*non enim coutuntur*) Erasmus sharply criticizes the invention of the otherwise nonexistent Latin verb *couti* to translate the Greek text.
The thought of this 'narrator's' sentence is repeated in the paraphrase on the woman's actual words. The repetition may owe something to the report of Hugh of St Cher (on 4:9) 305r that there is debate whether the sentence in 4:9 beginning 'for the Jews have no dealings' is spoken by the Evangelist or the Samaritan woman.

55

14 Jesus' thirst is expressly denied by Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 4:7–8) PG 73 296B; see n10 above.

15 The same play as here on the literal and extended meanings of *sitire* 'thirst' is found in Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 15.11, who in 15.12 also comments on the gradualism in Jesus' method of instruction.

16 'Riddle' translates *aenigma*. That Jesus' answer is 'enigmatic' and deliberately so to increase the woman's desire to learn is pointed out by Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 4:10) PG 73 296C–D.

17 The Vulgate text includes a *forsitan* 'perhaps' with 'you would have asked' in the conclusion of this contrary-to-fact condition, but Erasmus notes in the annotation on 4:10 (*tu forsitan petisses*) that the translator was mistakenly using *forsitan* for the Greek potential particle *ἄν* and thus introduced a false note of doubt. See also the paraphrase on chapter 5 n57.

18 Scriptural support for water as an image of the gift of the Holy Spirit is offered here by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 32.1, Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 4:10) PG 73 297A, and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 4:9–11).

19 There is extensive comparison of Nicodemus and the Samaritan woman, to the latter's advantage, also in Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 31.4, 32.1.

20 'Rebirth from above': *renascendo e supernis;* on the anew/from above question, see above, chapter 3 nn12 and 14. *Renascendo e supernis* can account for both possible meanings; in the recapitulation of Nicodemus' remarks in the next sentence, however, Erasmus gives only 'born anew.'

21 'Lord': *dominum*. In the narrative context and in Erasmus' own social context this is the courtesy title 'sir' or 'sire' at least as much as an appellation for divinity.

22 The courteous and respectful behaviour of the woman, and her desire to learn, are compared to the mocking and insulting treatment Jesus received at the hands of the Jews by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 31.4 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 4:9–11 and on 4:12–15), who also single out the increasingly complimentary forms of address she uses and her disregard for the heat as indications of her increasing respect and desire for knowledge.

23 'To draw water with': *quo haurias*, the more idiomatic Latin expression, as Erasmus notes in the annotation on 4:11 (*neque in quo haurias*) for the Vulgate text.

24 Erasmus specifically contradicts Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 4:11) PG 73 297B–C, who says that she did think Jesus was a magician.

56

25 'Water that bubbles out of ... the earth' is an allusion to the ordinary meaning in Greek and Latin of the expression 'living water.' The woman's confusion of the common and metaphorical meanings is pointed out here by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 32.1.

26 Erasmus suggests a simple social explanation for the husband to be present, thus rejecting a long tradition of exegesis. Cyril's view, *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 4:16) PG 73 301A, is that only a man's mind would be capable of such instruction; Augustine gives an allegorical and numerological analysis, *Tract in Joannem* 15.19–22, more or less followed by the *Gloss* and Nicholas of Lyra (on 4:16) 198v, and by Hugh of St Cher (on 4:16) 306r, for all of whom the 'husband' of 4:16 means the rational faculty. But see n27 below.

27 This interpretation, that the five previous men were not lawful husbands, aroused the objections of the Paris theologians and Noël Béda, who argued that since they were called *viri* they were indeed husbands. Erasmus replied in the *Elenchus* LB IX 500F–501A, *Supputatio* LB IX 630D–E and *Responsio* LB IX 712A that in Scripture the word *vir* is not in fact used exclusively of lawful husbands; and that in any case, the Gospel narrative being unclear on the point, he has had recourse to allegory, understanding Jesus to mean that even the duly wedded are not lawfully wedded if they have married only for lust. He goes on in the *Elenchus* to invoke the interpretation of 'husband' in 4:16 as equivalent to 'rational faculty,' and Augustine's allegories of the five previous men as the five physical senses (*Tract in Joannem* 15.21–2) or the five books of Moses (*De diversis quaestionibus* 64), both summarized in the *Catena aurea* 4.3 (on 4:13–18), interpretations of which there is no sign in the paraphrase.

28 The absence of any hostile or defensive response and the contrast with the Jews' behaviour are also mentioned by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 32.1–2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 4:16–22).

29 Cf 7:20 and 8:48 and the paraphrases on these verses, and for the 'magician' also the paraphrase on 4:13 and n24 above.

30 Or 'sir,' as noted n21 above.

31 A similar summary, but later in the discussion of the episode, of the stages of the woman's faith, distinguished by the titles she uses for Jesus, is given by Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 4:26) PG 73 316A–B.

57

32 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 33.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 4:16–22) describe the Samaritans as believing that God can be confined to a particular place. Cyril *Comm in Joannem* (on 4:20) PG 73 304A cites Moses' action described in Deut 27:1–12 as the source of this belief.

33 For these Samaritan ritual practices, cf 1 Kings 16:32–3, 2 Kings 17:10–11.

34 The inconcinnity of persons between 'you Jews' and 'they take pride' is Erasmus'.

35 Cf Acts 7:48 and 17:24, also alluded to here by Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 4:20) PG 73 301D.

36 For Samaritan worship of God and pagan gods, cf 2 Kings 17:26–41; Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 33.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 4:16–22) call these other gods 'demons.'

37 'Mixing fire with water' is a typical saying describing an *adynaton* or impossibility; it is *Adagia* IV iii 94: *Aquam igni misceri*. In his explication of the adage Erasmus cites Plutarch *Moralia* 950 (*De primo frigido* 14) and Cicero *Philippics* 13.49.

38 Here and in the following two paragraphs Erasmus speaks at length of the Old Testament dispensation as shadow and figure (or model, or outline) of the new order. Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 33.2 speaks of 'type'; Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 4:23–4) PG 73 313B–C of 'types,' 'shadow,' and 'figure'; Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 4:23, 24) extensively of 'type' and 'shadow.'

39 A common Old Testament theme, for instance in Ps 50:8–15, Hos 6:6, Isa 1:11–20

40 This statement seemed to Noël Béda, the Spanish monks, and the Paris theologians to declare that Erasmus was taking a clearly Lutheran position. He replied to all three: to Béda in the *Elenchus* LB IX 501A–B and *Supputatio* LB IX 630F–631B, to the Spaniards in the *Apologia adversus monachos* LB IX 1082C–D, and to the Paris doctors in the *Declarationes ad censuras Lutetiae vulgatas* LB IX 847A–849C. His arguments are first, that the statement in context plainly has reference to gentiles and Jews before baptism and addresses only the requirement for baptism, not the manner of life after baptism; and second, that *sola* 'alone' does not mean 'only and exclusive' but 'chief' or 'preeminent.' From one defence to the next the arguments remain the same, though there is a marked increase in the number of authorities he cites on the second point.

58

41 Here Erasmus makes the points also made by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 33.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 4:16–22), that Judaism has taught monotheism and the law.

42 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 33.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 4:16–22) both say that the salvation meant in 4:22 'salvation is from the Jews' may be the coming of Christ, rather than monotheism and the law. Erasmus reduces this second interpretation to the prophecies of the messiah.

43 For a similar list of the externals of Jewish religion and observation of their function as 'types,' cf Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 33.2.

44 Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 4:26) PG 73 316A–B also at this point reviews the woman's progress in readiness for faith, and attributes to her a suspicion that Jesus may be the messiah. Erasmus had introduced this theme earlier, in his paraphrase of 4:19; see n31 above.

45 According to Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 33.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 4:25–7), the Pentateuch passages on which the Samaritans based their expectation of a messiah were Gen 1:26 and 49:10, Deut 18:15. Hugh of St Cher (on 4:25) 307v has these and more; Nicholas of Lyra (on 4:25) 199r cites only Gen 49:10.

46 'Will come': *venturum*. In place of the Vulgate present *venit* 'is now coming,' Erasmus uses an unequivocally future form, a reading he defended in the

annotation on 4:25 (*quia Messias venit*). In fact the interlinear *Gloss* (on 4:25) 199r says of the *venit* 'quasi veniet' 'as if to say, will come,' and the marginal *Gloss* on the following verse paraphrases 'know that he whom you expect will come has come.'

59

47 'Humanity': *humanitatem*. The same word is applied to Jesus' behaviour in the paraphrase on 4:40 below, where it is translated 'humaneness.' Chrysostom speaks here of the disciples' wonder at 'the freedom from arrogance, the extraordinary humility,' *Hom in Joannem* 33.3, while Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 4:27) PG 73 316D–317A calls it 'gentleness and self-effacing manner.' Cyril then speaks of Jesus' *φιλανθρωπία*, ie 'love for humankind,' which may have had a bearing on Erasmus' choice of *humanitas* (though there is no certainty that Erasmus knew a Greek text of Cyril; see the translator's note xiii n9 above).

48 'An apostle': *apostola* '(woman) apostle.' The actual word 'apostle' is used of the woman only by Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 4:28–30), who goes on to call her 'ordained by faith,' but Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 34.1 says that she did the work of the evangelists, and even surpassed them in doing it without being called to it and in converting an entire town, not just a few people; Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 4:29) PG 73 317D calls her 'an adept and a spiritual leader.' The remark about the effect of her teaching on her own faith seems to be Erasmus' own.

49 The woman's pedagogical skill here in urging her fellow townsmen to make their own decision is noted by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 34.1, Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 4:29) PG 73 320A, and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 4:28–30).

50 'Was tormented': *cruciari*, common enough in this meaning in classical Latin, but in context surely also evoking the ultimate human torment to be suffered by Jesus.

51 The technique of developing teaching from context, often noted by Erasmus in the *Paraphrase on John*, is pointed out here by Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 4:31) PG 73 321A–B. Cyril and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 4:31–4) also observe that Jesus intends here to teach his disciples indifference to physical food, and that he does so by using puzzling or 'enigmatic' remarks to capture their attention (the latter point is also in Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 34.1).

52 Equivocating on what had been firmly stated earlier; see the paraphrase on 4:10 and nn10 and 14 above.

60

53 In the *Adagia* this appears as I v 32: *Alii sementem faciunt, alii metent* 'Some sow, others will reap.' In his discussion of its application Erasmus quotes Hesiod *Theogony* 599, Theognis 925, Livy 10.24.5, and in the *Scriptores historiae Augustae, Carus* 14.2–3. The proverb has affinities with *Adagia* I iv 41: *Alienam metis messem* 'You are reaping another's harvest.'

54 'Is in torment': *discruciatur*; see n50 above. For Jesus as a sower in this *Paraphrase* cf the paraphrase on 2:21–2 and n38, and just below, the paraphrase on 4:46.

55 The prophets are generally recognized as the sowers: Chrysostom *Hom in*

Joannem 34.2, Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 4:35, 36–7, 38) PG 73 325C–328B, Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 15.32, Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 4:35–7), the *Gloss* and Nicholas of Lyra (on 4:37) 199v and 200r, and Hugh of St Cher (on 4:37) 309r.

56 Cf Matt 11:12, Luke 16:16; according to Chrysostom on 8:31–47, *Hom in Joannem* 54.4, seizing the kingdom of heaven by force is a good, even the only possible, thing to do.

57 'The very facts of the case showed': *res ipsa declarat*, a variation on the common *res ipsa loquitur*. See the paraphrase on 3:2 and n5.

58 The contrast in what follows between the Samaritans' and the Jews' reception of Jesus is in the main similar to that drawn by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 35.1 and by Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 4:30) PG 73 320B–D.

61

59 Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 4:40) PG 73 329A says that the Samaritans' welcome of Jesus shows the eventual replacement of Israel in God's grace by gentiles and foreigners; but he does not imply anything about the temporal dispensation for that event, as Erasmus does here.

60 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 31.2 had noted at the outset of his treatment of chapter 4 that Jesus' behaviour was intended to avoid giving the Jews any justifiable reason for complaint.

61 'Humaneness': *humanitatis*; see n47 above.

62 'A real Jew': *vero Iudaeo*. Erasmus subscribes to the definition of 'Jew' as meaning in Hebrew 'confessor'; see the paraphrase on 19:19 and n30 below. Cf Shimon Markish *Erasmus and the Jews* tr Anthony Olcott (Chicago: University of Chicago Press 1986) 63.

63 The term 'messiah' appears (twice) in this sentence because, as mentioned in the annotation on 4:42 (*salvator mundi*) Erasmus found in the Greek manuscripts ὁ χριστός 'the Christ' added after 'saviour of the world.'

64 Though he does not name it, Erasmus means to specify Nazareth as the place where Jesus was without honour; see the paraphrase on 7:41. Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 35.1 is of the opinion that Capernaum is meant, though he mentions the belief of many that Jesus was a Nazarene by birth. Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 4:43–4) PG 73 332A takes the allusion as being to Nazareth. Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 16.1–2, Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 4:43–5), and the *Gloss* (on 4:44) 200r speak only of Galilee; Hugh of St Cher (on 4:43) 310r says Jesus avoided both Capernaum and Nazareth; Nicholas of Lyra (on 4:44) 200r makes it Nazareth.

62

65 Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 4:43) PG 73 332A similarly observed that Jesus' passing Nazareth by was a gift of grace in that it spared the inhabitants a worse penalty for openly rejecting Jesus.

66 See Matt 13:57, Mark 6:4, Luke 4:24. It is the version of Matthew and Mark, with their inclusion of house and family, that shapes Erasmus' paraphrase.

67 'Familiarity breeds contempt': *familiaritas contemptum parit*. Erasmus includes neither this nor the preceding proverb in his *Adagia*, perhaps just because they are so familiar. But see *Adagia* IV viii 59: *Cognatio movet invidiam* 'Kinship

stirs up envy'; cf the paraphrase on 7:1 n1. The comments of Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 35.2 on this passage include a version of the proverb: 'Familiarity generally makes people easy to scorn.' Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 4:43–4) PG 73 332A says, 'We naturally think nothing of the familiar, even if it is something great and honourable,' and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 4:43–5) has it as 'We humans generally despise those with whom we are familiar, always preferring the foreign and strange.'

68 There is a similar summary of the praise or blame due the Samaritans, Galileans, and Jews for their degree of susceptibility to belief in Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 35.2, Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 4:30) PG 73 320B–D, and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 4:43–5).

69 Another occurrence of the sowing motif; cf the paraphrase on chapter 3 n34. Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 4:43–4) PG 73 329D has a few sentences of extravagant indulgence in this metaphor.

63

70 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 35.2 says that this man is called a ruler either because of his royal lineage or because he had some official position, a view repeated by Hugh of St Cher (on 4:46) 310r and Nicholas of Lyra (on 4:46) 200r–v, and referred to by Erasmus in the annotation on 4:46 (*quidam regulus*). But none of these, nor Cyril, Augustine, or Theophylact, asserts that the ruler was actually a gentile; Augustine's discussion presumes he is a Galilean, *Tract in Joannem* 16.3.

71 Similarly on the limitations and progress of the man's faith Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 35.2, Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 4:46–8) PG 73 332C–333B, Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 16.3, Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 4:46–50).

72 Cf 20:29.

73 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 35.2 says that Jesus is reproaching the ruler's faith; Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 4:46–8) PG 73 333B says that he is not. Similarly just below, Chrysostom and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 4:46–50) consider it to the man's discredit that he does not believe until he has checked the time of the healing with his servants; Erasmus treats the man's advance in faith through this confirmation much more positively.

Chapter 5

64

1 The Gospel text says only 'a festival of the Jews'; Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 36.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 5:1–4) cautiously identify it as Pentecost.

2 For the rhetorical and moral contrast between Samaritans, Galileans, and gentiles on the one hand, and Pharisees on the other, see Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 5:1–4) PG 73 336B.

3 In giving the name as 'Bethesda' Erasmus here follows his Greek text, not the contemporary Vulgate 'Bethsaida.' As he notes in an annotation on 5:2 (*quae cognominatur Bethsaida*) even the text of Jerome *De locis hebraicis* (182, PL 23 884D–885A) had suffered corruption of 'Bethesda' into 'Bethsaida' (though

modern texts of Jerome correct to 'Bethesda'). Jerome gives the detail about the ritual function of the pool. That the pool *was* Probatica is the Vulgate reading; in another annotation on 5:2 (*est autem Hierosolymis probatica*) Erasmus expresses a preference for the Greek reading 'a pool *near* Probatica.'

4 In an annotation on 5:4 (*et movebatur aqua*) Erasmus points out that some old Greek manuscripts, supported by Chrysostom (*Hom in Joannem* 36.1), have it that the angel moved the water; in a subsequent annotation on the same verse (*post motum aquae*) he quotes this passage as active, 'and moved the water' instead of 'the water was moved.' The paraphrase retains the Vulgate version.

5 The baptismal imagery is also noted by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 36.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 5:1–4). Chrysostom comments that water and the grace of the Holy Spirit are necessary elements; Erasmus has added the action of the baptizer. See Payne *Theology of the Sacraments* 100–3, 156–71.

65

6 The Gospel text of 5:5 actually says 'thirty-eight years.' There is no obvious reason why Erasmus did not correct this mistake, repeated in the next sentence.

7 For the observation that Jesus' purpose is to demonstrate the paralytic's perseverance, see Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 36.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 5:5–7).

8 'Healing': *salus*. Here and frequently in this episode, *salus* is translated as 'healing' in an attempt to suggest Erasmus' play on its double meanings of 'good health' and 'salvation.'

9 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 37.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 5:5–7) also credit the paralytic with the intention of making this request of Jesus.

10 Similar lists of what the paralytic did not do are found in Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 37.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 5:5–7). Cf Job 3.

66

11 For the man's action as a reminder to the observers of his earlier condition, cf Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 37.1.

12 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 37.2 also notes that the man did not conceal the miracle.

13 Cf Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 5:11) PG 73 341C–D, who says that the healed man all but claims that his healer's authority surpasses that of the Sabbath.

14 In 'withdrawn from the crowd' the paraphrase follows the Vulgate text; but in the annotation on 5:13 (*Iesus autem declinavit a turba*) Erasmus prefers the Greek text, understanding Jesus to have hidden himself in the crowd at the pool, not away from it. The same two reasons for hiding are in Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 37.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 5:11–13); the first reason only is in Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 5:12–14) PG 73 344A.

15 Erasmus has dropped the location of this meeting, the temple, given in 5:14.

16 For the idea of bodily sickness as (often) a punishment for sin, see Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 38.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 5:14–16). For the opposite view, see 9:2–3 and the paraphrase on those verses.

67

17 The healed man's purpose is to win over the Pharisees according to Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 38.2, Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 5:14–16), and Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 5:15) PG 73 344C.

18 Cf the paraphrase on 5:1 and n2 above.

19 See Mark 2:27.

20 Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 17.10 points out that the Jews did not on this occasion charge Jesus with healing on the Sabbath, in which case he could have made the reply, alluded to here, that he made at Matt 12:11–12 and Luke 14:5 about the relative importance of seeing to the welfare of animals and people on the Sabbath.

21 In the annotation on 5:16 (*propterea persequebantur … in sabbato*) Erasmus had noted that his Greek texts here add 'and sought to kill him' but that the words appear in no Latin manuscripts. The paraphrase is on the Vulgate text.

22 For 'Lord of the Sabbath' cf Matt 12:8, Mark 2:28, Luke 6:5.

68

23 That the Father does not cease from work in and through creation even on the Sabbath is noted by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 38.2, Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 5:17–18), and Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 5:17) PG 73 348A–B.

24 In commenting here on Jesus' use of rhetorical means to give his words persuasive effect, Erasmus follows Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 38.3, 39.1–2; Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 21.5 and 12; and Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2–3 (various places in the treatment of 5:19–47) PG 73 349–432, all of whom point out Jesus' application of rhetorical and pedagogical principles familiar to them from the rhetorically centered Greco-Roman system of education.

25 The syntactical inconcinnity of the two expressions introduced by 'sometimes … sometimes' is Erasmus'.

26 'Supremacy': *auctoritas*, and so also in what follows

27 A theme found in several variations in classical literature and in the *Adagia*, such as II x 94, III ix 3, but notably I vi 32: *Heroum filii noxae* 'Great men have trouble from their children.' Erasmus has a long essay on this adage, with quotations from a number of classical writers, including Homer *Odyssey* 2.276–7 'Few sons indeed are equal to their fathers; Most men are worse, few better than their sires,' and reference to a lengthy passage on the subject of the incapabilities of sons of politically prominent fathers in the *Scriptores historiae Augustae* (*Severus* 20.4–21.12). See also Horace *Odes* 3.6.45–8 'What does not detracting time demean? Our fathers' generation, worse than its fathers, has borne us lesser still, and soon to yield a more flawed offspring.'

69

28 Cf 1 Tim 6:15, Rev 17:14, Rev 19:16.

29 Cf Phil 2:10.

30 'Through him' is a correction by the translator for Erasmus' 'through whom,' falsely parallel to 'by whom' and 'by whose.'

70

31 The contemporary Vulgate text of 5:24 here being paraphrased read *transiet*

'will pass over' (that is, 'from death into life'). But the corresponding verb of the Greek text is in the perfect tense, as Erasmus observes in the annotation on 5:24 (*sed transiet*). Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 19.7–8 had a Latin text with a perfect tense verb, and made much of the tense in his explication. So here Erasmus stresses the perfective aspect with 'already has eternal life,' though a few lines below, in 'moves his dwelling,' he retreats to a present tense, perhaps with an eye to possible defenders of the received reading.

32 A similar symbolic connection between the raising of Lazarus (11:1–44) and the general resurrection is made here by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 39.3 and Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 19.9. Augustine and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 5:25–9) add to Lazarus the raising of the widow's son (Luke 7:11–15) and Jairus' daughter (Matt 9:18–26, Mark 5:21–43, Luke 8:41–56). So here Erasmus says 'the calling of a few,' not just the one reported in this Gospel.

33 For 'to judge the living and the dead' cf Acts 10:42, 1 Pet 4:5, 2 Tim 4:1, and the Nicene and Apostles' creeds.

34 In modern texts 5:27 and the beginning of 5:28 read: 'and he gave him the power of judgment, because he is a son of man. Do not wonder at this ...' But Erasmus here follows Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 39.3, who punctuates after 'judgment' and joins the clauses 'because he is a son of man' and 'do not wonder at this'; Chrysostom takes them as expressing the reason for the hearer's presumed amazement at the idea of judgment being given to Jesus, and as implying that this son of man is also the Son of God. Although Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 19.16 separates the two clauses as in modern texts, he suggests the idea Erasmus expresses in the following sentence, that Christ was given as a man what he had always possessed as God. Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 5:26, 27) PG 73 381C–383B and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 5:25–9) agree with Chrysostom. Erasmus has a long note on the passage in the annotation on 5:27 (*quia filius hominis est*), where he summarizes Chrysostom, Augustine, and Cyril on the point.

35 Faith and works together are emphasized in the discussion of the passage by Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 5:25–9).

71

36 In paraphrasing 'my testimony is not true' Erasmus follows Chrysostom's explanation of this statement, *Hom in Joannem* 40.1: Jesus is not asserting an absolute falsity in his witness to himself but is framing his remark in terms of the expectations and preconceptions of his hearers; similarly Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 5:31–5).

37 Cf Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 3 (on 5:35) PG 73 401B–C, who describes the Baptist as a lamp whose source of light is God and Christ, and more generally, Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 23.2–3.

38 For 'the true light' cf 1:9.

39 A similar comparison in the explication of this passage is given by Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 23.2–3. More clearly parallel are the comparisons made in the discussions of 3:30 by Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 2 (on 3:30) PG 73 265A–B and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 3:28–30). Cyril compares the Baptist to the most brilliant star in the night sky, at which all marvel until in the predawn light it begins gradually to yield to the more splendid sun.

40 Cf 1:27 and Mark 1:7, Luke 3:16.

41 Erasmus' expansion of the Gospel text 'I have a testimony greater than John' follows the point he makes in the annotation on 5:36 (*ego autem ... Ioanne*), that the sentence is elliptical and not meant to suggest that the *person* John is being compared to the *witness* of the Father; instead, the Father's *witness* is called greater than John's *witness*. By extension, then, the person of the one is greater than the person of the other. The point is one that appeals to a dialectically and rhetorically trained mind.

72

42 'Themselves' is the reading of all the editions published in Erasmus' lifetime except for the first, which reads 'you see the deeds yourselves.' In Latin the difference is only one letter, between *ipsa* and *ipsi*. Cf the annotation on 5:36 (*ea ipsa*), a discussion of the rhetorical stress in 5:36 on *opera* 'works' or 'deeds.'

43 Cf 3:5–8 and 4:24, and the paraphrases on those verses.

44 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 40.3 also mentions the voice at the Jordan in connection with 'you have never heard his voice,' and goes on to discuss Old Testament instances, Moses, David, and the prophets who claimed to have seen God or heard his voice; similarly Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 5:36–8). Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 3 (on 5:37, 38) PG 73 412D–413D and 417C explains 5:37–8 by extensive reference to Exod 19:17–19 and its evidence that God condescended to the human perceptual limitations of the Jews; he adds that the Pharisees in Jesus' audience here have the Exodus incident in mind as an unspoken rebuttal. Erasmus' expansion draws on both these Fathers.

45 'While you busy yourselves' is Erasmus' expansion of *scrutamini* in 5:39, which, along with the Greek it translates, can be taken either as indicative, 'you search [the Scriptures]' or imperative, 'search [the Scriptures]!' Here he prefers the indicative; in the annotation on 5:39 (*scrutamini scripturas*) he says either is acceptable. Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 40.3 and 41.1 reads the imperative; Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 3 (on 5:39–40) PG 73 420C–D takes it as indicative.

46 This sentence is the paraphrase on 5:38, delayed until this point. Erasmus generally paraphrases in strict order.

47 For 'doorway' cf 10:7 and 9.

48 The hunting metaphor is used in the paraphrase on 5:41 also by Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 3 (on 5:41) PG 73 421C–D: 'not ... hunting for [ϑηρώμενος] honours from you or others.' Erasmus substitutes *humana gloria* for the Vulgate *claritas* 'splendour' in accordance with his remark in the annotation on 5:41 (*claritatem*) that *gloria* is a better translation for the Greek δόξα than *claritas*. Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 41.1 also adds to the theme of Jesus' rejection of human glory the theme of his desire for human salvation.

73

49 Cf Deut 6:5; Matt 22:37, Mark 12:30, Luke 10:27.

50 In 'you do not accept' Erasmus here makes the correction from the perfect tense of the contemporary Vulgate to the present of the Greek (and modern Vulgate) text that he notes in the annotation on 5:43 (*non accepistis*).

51 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 41.1–2, followed by Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 5:43–7), identifies this figure as Antichrist, as does Augustine in the discussion of 7:18, in a reference back to 5:43, *Tract in Joannem* 29.8. Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 3 (on 5:43) PG 73 424A–B identifies him as 'the false-named one ... who does business in his own name.'

52 For the Jews' actual hatred for God cf Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 41.2.

53 See Jer 7:4.

54 See above, the paraphrase on 5:41 and n49, and Lev 19:18.

74

55 The hunting metaphor is also in Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 3 (on 5:44) PG 73 424C: 'those who hunt for [*ϑηρωμένοις*] honours from mortals.' Cf n48 above.

56 See Exod 20:18–19 and Deut 18:16–22; Acts 3:22–3, 7:37. The Deuteronomy passage is quoted by Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 3 (on 5:46) PG 73 428B–432A, but Cyril includes a typological analysis of Moses that Erasmus ignores. Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 41.2 says that Jesus deliberately did not quote the relevant texts of Moses here in order to force his hearers to search them out; but Erasmus provides his readers with a summary of the essential material.

57 'Of course': *nimirum*. With this word Erasmus replaces the Vulgate *forsitan* 'perhaps,' which he notes in the annotation on 5:46 (*si enim crederetis, etc*) is a translator's mistake for the Greek potential particle *ἄν* and wrongly calls into doubt what Jesus is stating positively.

Chapter 6

75

1 The same reason for Jesus' move into Galilee is in Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 42.1 and Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 3 (on 6:1) PG 73 437A–B, both of whom moralize on his prudential withdrawal.

2 'Ignorant knowledge of the law': *imperita legis peritia*, an oxymoronic play on words

3 Cana, not mentioned in the Gospel text here, is specifically excluded as the destination also by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 42.1 and Hugh of St Cher (on 6:1) 322r, citing Chrysostom.

4 Erasmus uses 'lake' for the 'sea' of the Gospel text here, incorporating the observation made by Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 6:1–4), the *Gloss* (on 6:1) 203v, and Hugh of St Cher (on 6:1) 322r, that 'sea' in this place means 'lake'; but see the paraphrase on 6:18 and n28 below. The same explanation, with the additional information that Herod the tetrarch had rebuilt the town and renamed it in honour of the emperor Tiberius, is given by Nicholas of Lyra (on 6:1) 203v. This refounding of the town by Herod is noted by Eusebius and Jerome *Chronicon* under 28 AD (PL 27 444) and also mentioned by Josephus *Jewish Antiquities* 18.36, so it is rather surprising that Erasmus ascribes it to Tiberius himself.

5 Erasmus offers three motives, all favourable, for the crowd's following Jesus into the wilderness. Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 42.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 6:1–4) explicitly deny that the crowd has any interest in

his teaching and claim that it only wants to gawk at the wonder-worker. Hugh of St Cher (on 6:2) 322v and Nicholas of Lyra (on 6:2) 203v have the same favourable motives as Erasmus, including the desire for instruction, but add that some people, like the Pharisees, wanted to catch him out in blasphemy.

6 While Erasmus, like the church Fathers and other commentators, generally presents Jesus' actions as both literally and tropologically exemplary for all Christians, in this chapter and in the paraphrases on chapters 4, 8, 10, and 13 he points the moral specifically to clerical behaviour. It is the bishop who for Erasmus, in the Catholic tradition, has primary responsibility for the sacerdotal, pastoral, and teaching functions of ordained ministry; see James Kelsey McConica 'Erasmus and the Grammar of Consent' in *Scrinium Erasmianum* ed J. Coppens (Leiden: E.J. Brill 1969) II 86, and Manfred Hoffmann 'Erasmus on Church and Ministry,' ERSY 6 (1986) 17–30. Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 42.1 also finds Jesus' behaviour exemplary, but only by implication is the example referred to teachers of the gospel. Theophylact applies the example to the circumstances required for anyone who would teach mysteries, *Enarr in Joannem* (on 6:1–4). The *Gloss* (on 6:5) 203v–204r refers it to the inner life and says we are not to be harassed by our following crowd of passions. But Hugh of St Cher (on 6:3) 322v speaks, like Erasmus, specifically of the cleric and his pastoral role: 'But note that Jesus does not sit on the mountain without his disciples, because the preacher or prelate ought to have his own life at heart only in so far as he does not abandon others, but is with them in care and concern: Acts 20. Tend to yourselves and to your whole flock, in which the Holy Spirit has placed you as bishops to direct the church.' For other expressions of Erasmus' views on the shortcomings of clergy and religious, see among the *Colloquies* eg *De captandis sacerdotiis* 'In Pursuit of Benefices'; for some of the abuses mentioned here, Ἰχθυοφαγία 'A Fish Diet.' Cf *Moriae encomium* CWE 27 132–5 on monks and preachers.

7 'Walk rather than sit' is a play on the use of 'walk,' very frequent in the Epistles for the activity of (Christian) living; see eg Rom 6:4, Gal 5:16, Eph 5:2, 1 John 2:6.

76

8 'Passed over': *transferretur*, another instance of word-play on the meaning of Pascha, Passover; cf the paraphrase on 2:13 and n30. For the present passage, Hugh of St Cher (on 6:4) 322v–323r includes in his comment a number of word-plays on *transire* 'pass over.'

9 A similar typological explanation of Jesus' refusal to go to Jerusalem for this Passover as indicating his break from the law is found in Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 42.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 6:1–4). A more elaborate version is given by Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 3 (on 6:1) PG 73 437C–440D.

10 Jesus' pedagogical method in his testing and preparing of Philip is pointed out by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 42.1–2, Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 3 (on 6:5–6) PG 73 445B–D, Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 24.3, Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 6:5–9), and Hugh of St Cher (on 6:5–6) 323r (all of whom say, as Erasmus does not, that Philip needs such instruction more than the others.) According to Hugh Jesus means to draw attention to the shortage as a

means of making the event more memorable to all the onlookers; Erasmus makes Jesus instruct only the disciples on this point.

11 Similar observations are made by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 42.2 and Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 3 (on 6:5–6) PG 73 445B–D.

77

12 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 42.2, Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 6:5–9), Hugh of St Cher (on 6:8) 323v, and Nicholas of Lyra (on 6:8) 204r all note Andrew's relatively more advanced understanding, his expectation that the size of the increase in food would be proportional to the amount originally available, and Jesus' ability to create what he wanted from nothing.

13 The obedience of both the crowd and the disciples is underlined by both Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 42.2 and Hugh of St Cher (on 6:10) 324r (who cites Chrysostom) as indicative of the beginning of belief even before the miracle of feeding, and as in itself miraculous. Hugh's language shows strong affinities to Erasmus' here: 'And note that they sat down in groups as instructed by the apostles, on whom the Lord had enjoined this task. For the apostles obeyed instantly, and did not make an uproar or say "What is this, that he orders the crowd to sit down when there isn't any food ready yet?"'

14 The breaking of the bread is not mentioned in this Gospel but is in Matt 14:19 and 15:36, Mark 6:41 and 8:6, Luke 9:16, 1 Cor 11:24.

15 Erasmus remarks in the annotation on 6:11 (*distribuit discumbentibus*) that while the Vulgate read 'he distributed to the seated people,' his Greek authorities read 'he distributed to the disciples, and the disciples distributed to the seated people,' thus following the other evangelists (Matt 14:19, 15:36; Mark 6:41, 8:6; Luke 9:16). This reading, though attested, is not preferred in modern editions; see Nestle-Aland 26th ed on 6:11. It appears in Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 3 (on 6:11) PG 73 453D, though later Cyril adds that Jesus nourishes us himself and through the disciples, who give us spiritual food: (on 6:13) PG 73 460B–C, 464D. Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 42.2 does not include the extra phrase but Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 6:10–13) does. The interlinear *Gloss* (on 6:11) 204r explains that the distribution is carried out both by Jesus and by the disciples, while the marginal note at the same place suggests that Jesus' distribution is to the disciples, and theirs is to the people. Hugh of St Cher (on 6:11) 324r follows the interlinear *Gloss*, while Nicholas of Lyra (on 6:11) 204r says that Jesus instructs the disciples to carry out the distribution. Erasmus' paraphrase here follows his observation in the annotation rather than the Vulgate text, and elaborates the addition as pertaining typologically and tropologically to the sacramental function of bishops, which in respect of the Eucharist is in his view intimately connected with their teaching function. See eg the dedicatory letter to the *Paraphrase on John*, 5 above; *Ecclesiastes* LB V 801C, 820F, 826C–D, 830E; Payne *Theology of the Sacraments* 133–6; the references in n6 above; and the rest of the paraphrase on chapter 6.

16 Cf below, the paraphrases on 6:35, 6:51–9, 6:61–6, and the notes in those places.

17 The exemplary function of Jesus' giving thanks before the meal is also pointed out by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 42.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 6:10–13).

18 In 'by his will' and 'what he knew' the paraphrase follows a Greek text here in reading a singular verb 'as much as he wished' in 6:11, not the plural 'as much as they wished' of the Vulgate. In the annotation on 6:11 (*de piscibus quantum volebant*) Erasmus defends the reading with citations from Cyril and Theophylact. Modern texts of the Greek have the plural.

78

19 The same reason for the surplus is found in Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 42.3, Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 3 (on 6.12–13) PG 73 457B, Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 6:10–13), and Nicholas of Lyra (on 6:12) 204r.

20 In his annotation on 6:13 (*duodecim cophinos fragmentorum ex quinque panibus hordaceis et duobus piscibus* 'twelve baskets of leftovers from the five barley loaves and two fish'), Erasmus points out that the addition 'and two fish' is not in the Greek or in one old Latin manuscript. His paraphrase here sidesteps the issue of the composition of the leftovers, while the two following references to the original five loaves and two fish permit, without requiring, defence of the received Vulgate text.

21 That this is the lesson of the gathering of the remains is also noted by Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 3 (on 6:12–13) PG 73 457C–460D and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 6:10–13).

22 In the annotation on 6:14 (*quia hic est vere propheta*) Erasmus observes that the Greek ὁ προφήτης, with its definite article, requires *ille propheta* in Latin, '*the* prophet'; he also mentions the prophet promised in Mal 4:5 and Deut 18:15. The same point about the Greek article is made by Hugh of St Cher (on 6:14) 324v.

23 The accusation of gluttony is levelled against the crowd also by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 42.3 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 6:14–15). But Erasmus' word-play with the similar sounds of the Latin for 'belly' and 'brain,' *ventris* and *mentis*, in 'they are more aware of benefits to belly than to brain' may be inspired by a generalization of Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 25.10 on the episode 6:1–44: 'Ille post miraculi sacramentum et sermonem infert, ut si fieri potest, qui pasti sunt, pascantur et quorum satiavit panibus ventres, satiet et sermonibus mentes.' Translated to preserve the rhetorical colour this might read 'He after the miracle's wonder applied words, so that if possible those who had been fed might feed again, and the brains of those whose bellies he had filled with bread he might fill with boon.'

24 The same moral in Jesus' action is pointed out by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 42.3, Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 3 (on 6:15) PG 73 461B–D, and the interlinear *Gloss* and Nicholas of Lyra (on 6:15) 204v, but without a specific application to the clergy. Hugh of St Cher (on 6:15) 324v quotes the *Gloss* and Chrysostom to the same effect.

25 For Jesus' home in Capernaum, cf Matt 4:13 and Mark 2:1.

26 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 43.1 and following him Hugh of St Cher (on 6:17) 325r both describe the disciples' passion for the absent Jesus in terms of the heat of love.

79

27 A general identification of the storm and darkness with spiritual dangers is also in Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 3 (on 6:17, 18) PG 73 468C–469D, and in

overwhelming detail in Hugh of St Cher (on 6:18) 325r–v. Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 25.5–6, followed by the *Gloss* (on 6:16) 204v, refers specifically to the end of the world, perhaps reflected in 'he is present to the end of time' in the next paragraph of the paraphrase.

28 Erasmus brings in the point of idiom mentioned sooner in the chapter by the earlier commentators; see n4 above.

29 'No storm is deadly where he who makes all things calm is near at hand': *nec tempestas illic exitialis est, ubi is in propinquo est qui serenat omnia. Serenare* is a rare poetic verb for weather clearing; its use and context here are reminiscent of the description of Jupiter's countenance in Virgil *Aeneid* 1.255: *vultu quo caelum tempestatesque serenat* 'the countenance with which he clears the sky and storms.' Though the Evangelist himself does not emphasize Jesus as the calmer of the storm in this episode (in contrast to the similar episodes in Matt 14:24–32 and Mark 6:48–51), that aspect is brought out by the commentators: Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 43.1, Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 3 (on 6:17–21) PG 73 468B–472D, Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 6:16–21), and Hugh of St Cher (on 6:18) 325r–v.

30 The mention of spectres is added from Matt 14:26, Mark 6:49. Hugh of St Cher (on 6:19) 325v and the *Gloss* (on 6:19) 204v both say that Matthew explains the disciples' fear in this way.

31 That the storm stopped is another detail not in this Gospel but in Matt 14:32 and Mark 6:51; similarly Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 43.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 6:16–21).

80

32 The paraphrase here follows the contemporary Vulgate text in describing the crowd as giving thanks to God at the time of the feeding. But Erasmus reports in his annotation on 6:23 (*gratias agentes Deo*) that one of his Greek copies lacks the words entirely and the other says 'when the Lord gave thanks.'

33 The interpretation of the crowd's behaviour and question as resulting from their suspicion of a miracle is also made by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 43.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 6:22–6).

34 For the change in the crowd's wishes, described in the next paragraph of the paraphrase as fickleness, cf the similar treatment by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 43.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 6:22–6).

35 That this is the nature and tone of Jesus' reply is noted by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 44.1 (who sees the rebuke as restrained), Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 3 (on 6:26) PG 73 475B, and Hugh of St Cher (on 6:26) 326r.

36 'Food ... by which' translates *pabulum quo*, the text of all the editions published in Erasmus' lifetime. LB VII 545C has the unintelligible misprint *pabulum quam*.

37 An expression of Erasmus' firm belief in gradualism in teaching method, with the noteworthy addition of what the method requires from the teacher. For the general idea, compare his *De pueris instituendis* CWE 26 297–346, especially 334–46, which is largely based on Quintilian *Institutio oratoria* 1. Here Erasmus' pedagogical comment is independent of any similar remark in his usual sources; cf the paraphrase on 2:24–5 and n42, and on 3:3 and n7.

81

38 Interpretation of the 'food that perishes' in 6:27 as referring to the digestive process is found also in Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 3 (on 6:27) PG 73 481B.

39 The crowd's inattention and incomprehension is also noted by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 45.1.

40 Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 3 (on 6:29) PG 73 496A–D also lists the works of the law that do not give eternal life, but his list contains mostly sacrifices, with some mention of festivals.

82

41 Erasmus' paraphrase of 6:31 reintroduces the name of Moses, whom Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 45.1 says the people deliberately omitted to name here, as they also omitted any mention of God.

42 'Weary ... in drawing them' translates *defatigavit ab alliciendis illis* in the editions of 1523, 1524, and 1534. But *illis* disappeared from the 1535 edition and was not included in LB VII 546E; the sense then would be 'the people's reply still did not weary Jesus' gentle patience from those who were to be drawn ...' Although it is general practice in CWE to translate the text of the last edition published in Erasmus' lifetime, in this case the earlier reading seems preferable as being a more usual form of expression than the substantive use of the gerundive in the later reading; an *illis* could easily be lost in typesetting.

43 The same sort of comment on the people's reply, emphasizing their demand for a sign and specification of what sign it is to be, as well as their concentration only on physical needs, is in Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 45.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 6:31–4); Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 3 (on 6:30, 31) PG 73 497D comments on their gluttony only.

44 Moses as the servant of God is a frequent biblical theme; see eg Exod 4:10, 14:31. Moses' servant status is emphasized in the treatment of this passage by Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 3 (on 6:32) PG 73 500A.

45 Cf Ps 78:24.

46 The paraphrase corrects a deficiency of the Vulgate text pointed out by Erasmus in the annotation on 6:32 (*non dedit vobis panem*): by omitting any demonstrative in the Latin to represent the force of the Greek article in τὸν ἄρτον 'the bread' the Vulgate makes Jesus appear to deny Moses' miracle: 'He did not give you bread.' In fact, as is clear in the Greek, Jesus says only that 'he did not give you *the* bread from heaven,' truly heavenly bread in a profounder sense than food for the body.

47 'Birds ... of heaven': *volucres coeli*. The comparison between describing manna as the bread of heaven and birds as of heaven is also made here by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 45.1, citing Ps 8:8, and by Hugh of St Cher (on 6:32) 327r, citing Matt 13:4. In both passages the birds are called *volucres coeli* in the Vulgate.

48 'Comes from God himself' paraphrases the Greek text. In the annotation on 6:33 (*panis enim verus est*) Erasmus points out that the contemporary Vulgate text 'for it is true bread' is not supported by the Greek or by older Latin texts, both of which read 'for it is bread of God' (as does the modern Vulgate).

83

49 'They loved satiety better than salvation, and they looked for a sater rather

than a saviour': *saturitatem amabant potius quam salutem, et saturatorem requirebant potius quam servatorem*. Erasmus is playing with the similar sounds of the words for satiety/sater and salvation/saviour.

50 'Word': *sermo*; for *sermo* as Erasmus' choice for the term to express the divine essence in its relation to humankind, see the preface to this *Paraphrase* in chapter 1, 15–17 above and the notes there. Identification of the bread in this verse as God the word, and not the flesh of Christ in verse 51, is made by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 45.2 and Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 3 (on 6:32, 33) PG 73 501B. Hugh of St Cher (on 6:35) 327r quotes the Chrysostom passage. That 6:35–50 treats of the bread as word seems to be the view of these commentators; cf also nn67 and 69. See also the paraphrase on 6:11 and n15 above. For the identification of the word and the Eucharist, cf *Ecclesiastes* LB V 801C, 826C–D, and the paraphrase on 6:63 below and the notes there.

51 'Words': *sermo* again; see preceding note.

52 Cf Rom 3:29.

53 Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 3 (on 6:37) PG 73 525B also mentions faith as the means of coming to Christ, but Erasmus' paraphrase, with the allusion to the opposition of faith and the law, owes more to the spirit of the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians; see eg Rom 3:21–31, 5:1–2; Gal 2:16, 3:8–9 and the paraphrases on these passages.

84

54 Cf 1:18.

55 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 46.1 and Hugh of St Cher (on 6:41) 328v also note the behaviour of the crowd as contemptuous and insulting, and make the same contrast between their former behaviour when they were well fed and their present actions, with reference to Phil 3:19 'whose god is the belly.'

56 The paraphrase here maintains the Vulgate text, though Erasmus notes in the annotation on 6:41 (*quia dixisset ego sum panis vivus*) that the Greek text and his oldest Latin manuscripts do not contain any word for 'living.'

57 Cyril, in a remark on this passage about the Jews' inadequate understanding of the prophets, *Comm in Joannem* 4 (on 6:42) PG 73 549A–B, makes a similar observation about damage wrought by not applying the eyes of the heart to understanding the excellence of the saints but relying instead on the insignificance of the body.

58 Erasmus remarks in the annotation on 6:42 (*nonne hic est filius Ioseph*) that the Greek text and the oldest Latin manuscripts, as well as Augustine (*Tract in Joannem* 26.1), all include the name 'Jesus' in this question; since even in his own day people commonly use the personal names of those who lack social standing, he is surprised that the contemporary Vulgate text has omitted such a mark of contempt here. The paraphrase, however, maintains the Vulgate reading; cf the similar questions without the personal name in Matt 13:55 and Luke 4:22.

59 The same observation is made here by Hugh of St Cher (on 6:43) 328v.

60 Cf eg Matt 13:13–15 and Mark 8:18. Augustine at the beginning of his sermon on 6:41–59, *Tract in Joannem* 26.1, has a similar, more freely worded echo.

61 Cf Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 46.1, who claims 6:44 as evidence for the freedom of human will and its concomitant need for help from God.

Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 45.3 had discussed free will as the reason why those who do not believe are not free from blame. Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 26.1–7 discusses the essential role of belief and the manner of God's drawing humans to himself, seeing it based in his love and the human desire for pleasure; he says (26.2) that 'no one can believe except willingly.' Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 6:41–4) repeats Chrysostom's remarks on free will and help from God, and offers as another explanation that God draws those who are fit for it. Hugh of St Cher (on 6:44) 328v quotes from these passages of Augustine and Chrysostom. For Erasmus' general views on free will and grace, see eg *De libero arbitrio diatribe* and for discussions, Payne *Theology of the Sacraments* 74–84; B.A. Gerrish '*De Libero Arbitrio* (1524): Erasmus on Piety, Theology, and the Lutheran Dogma' in Richard DeMolen ed *Essays on the Works of Erasmus* (New Haven: Yale University Press 1978) 187–204; Robert Coogan 'The Pharisee against the Hellenist: Edward Lee versus Erasmus' *Renaissance Quarterly* 39 (1986) 476–506.

85

62 'Taught by God': *a Deo docti*, an improvement on the Vulgate *docibiles Dei*. In the annotation on 6:45 (*docibiles*) Erasmus makes a strong attack on the Vulgate's invented word *docibiles*, which if it existed would mean 'teachable.'

63 The association of grace and the drawing to the Father is also made here by Hugh of St Cher (on 6:45) 329r; cf n61 above.

64 Cf 4:24.

65 Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 4 (on 6:46) PG 73 557B–C says that the 'no one' of 6:46 is a way of alluding specifically to the Jewish beliefs about Moses without offending the audience by naming him directly; Erasmus makes the allusion explicit.

66 Cf Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 25.12 (on 6:29) and 26.1 (on 6:41), who says that to believe is to eat the living bread.

86

67 Again, 'word' is *sermo*; see nn50 and 51 above.

68 'Simpler': *crassius*. *Crassus* is regularly used by Erasmus to describe persons or ideas that are thick(-headed), dull(-witted), stupid, slow, foolish, or simple with the implication, as here, of simple-minded; it is only a step above *carnalis* 'unspiritual' and suggests that which is not very far along in spiritual progress. It occurs just below in the sentence comparing Nicodemus and the Samaritan woman to this crowd, 'the still more foolish people.'

69 For Erasmus' juxtaposition of 'word' with both 'flesh' and 'bread' in 6:51, cf the similar juxtapositions in Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 46.1, Hugh of St Cher (on 6:51) 329r, and Nicholas of Lyra (on 6:50) 206r.
In 1526, in the *Detectio praestigiarum*, a reply to a follower of Zwingli who had claimed that Erasmus' views on the Eucharist were sympathetic to the reformers, Erasmus defended the orthodoxy of his views by reference to this part of the *Paraphrase on John*: 'Again in John 6, where the Lord in puzzling statements commends his heavenly teaching and according to some also the receiving of his body and blood in the sacrament, though it was permissible for me to follow only the former interpretation [cf n50 above] nonetheless I

add this: "This flesh that you see is also living bread, which I shall pay and hand over to death to ransom the life of the whole world. Believe, take, and eat [he misquotes himself].'" (ASD IX-1 255). The passage continues with more quotation and argument from the paraphrase on chapter 6 and other of Erasmus' treatments of the relevant New Testament texts, all of it aiming to show that he does not regard the eucharistic bread and wine as mere symbols. A useful account of Erasmus' quarrel with the reformers over the nature of the Eucharist is given by C. Augustijn in his introduction to the ASD edition of the *Detectio praestigiarum*, IX-1 213–28.

70 'Words': *sermo*; see nn50, 51, 67, and 69 above. Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 46.2 also remarks here on the mystery contained in Jesus' words and assigns it a pedagogical function.

71 The simile is borrowed from 15:1–8. For the seed metaphor in the next sentence, see eg the paraphrase on 2:21–2 and n38.

72 Cf 3:4 and 4:11–12, and the paraphrases on these verses.

73 The opposition of the impossible and the necessary is found in Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 47.1, Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 6:53–6), and (quoting Chrysostom) Hugh of St Cher (on 6:52) 329v.

74 For comparison by things unlike each other, a regular form of amplification, see the paraphrase on chapter 3 n52.

75 'Author and pioneer of the resurrection': *auctor ac princeps resurrectionis*. The phrase echoes Col 1:18, 1 Cor 15:20, Heb 5:9 and 12:2.

76 For the metaphor cf the paraphrase on 6:52 and n71 above. For the emphasis on the mystical body of Christ and its members in the treatment of 6:55–9, cf Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 46.3 and Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 26.13–15.

87

77 Cf the parable of the members and the body in 1 Cor 12:12–27.

78 Erasmus' paraphrase indicates a change in his understanding of the rhetorical structure of 6:57. The text of the verse gives a sentence of four clauses joined by three occurrences of Greek *καί*, Latin *et*, meaning either 'and' or 'also.' Hence the verse may be read 'As the living Father sent me *and* I live because of the Father *and* whoever eats me will *also* live because of me.' The question that arises is which, if either, of the first two *ands* is to be read as 'also' ('also' as the reading of the third is indisputable). In the annotation on 6:57 (*sicut misit me vivens pater et ego vivo*) Erasmus had taken the first as 'also': 'As the living Father sent me, so I *also* live ... *and* whoever eats me ...' The paraphrase, however, presupposes reading instead 'As the living Father sent me *and* I live because of the Father, so *also* whoever eats me ...'

79 'Has truly come down': *descendit*, translated here as perfect tense because the Latin verb, Erasmus points out in the annotation on 6:58 (*qui de coelo descendit*), translates a Greek past participle, not a present. In Latin the present and perfect tenses of this word are identical in form.

80 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 47.2 remarks that Jesus was teaching in the synagogue partly because he wanted a good crowd. Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 4 (on 6:60) PG 73 597C–D and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 6:60–3) also cite the location as evidence for Jesus' intention of addressing a number of people. Erasmus omits the Gospel's mention of the location of the synagogue, Capernaum.

88

81 For the elaboration of the respective roles of flesh and spirit in this paragraph, covering 6:61–3, cf the elaborations of Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 47.2, on spiritual, not earthly, understanding, and Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 27.5–6, on the function of flesh as the means of spiritual learning and action, and on the spiritual union of all the members with one another and with Christ. See also Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 6:64, 65).

82 For this theme cf the paraphrase on 3:1–15.

83 'My words': *sermo meus;* see nn50, 51, 67, 69, and 70 above.

84 Cf above, especially the paraphrases on 6:11 and n15, 6:35 and n50, and nn67 and 69.

85 'My words': *sermonem meum;* see nn50, 51, 67, 69, 70, and 83 above. But in the next sentence 'For the words' Erasmus uses *verba,* not *sermo,* following the Gospel text of 6:63, while three sentences beyond that, 'And whoever does not believe my words,' he reverts to *sermonibus meis.*

89

86 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 47.3 comments here that Jesus uses no wiles to retain the deserters and also does not beg or force some to stay, or praise those who did; Jesus thus shows that he has no need of followers, though they do of him, and that his prestige does not suffer by their departure. Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 6:69–72) has a similar comment.

90

87 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 47.3, Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 27.9, Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 6:69–72), the interlinear *Gloss* and Nicholas of Lyra (on 6:68) 207r all agree that Peter is speaking for 'all' or for 'the group'; none specifies 'the church.'

88 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 47.3 has a similar remark on Jesus' not praising Peter.

89 The second reason given here for Jesus to hint at his coming betrayal, to warn the others to avoid the same evil, is also given by Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 27.7.

Chapter 7

1 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 48.1, in prefatory remarks to his treatment of chapter 7, discusses the spiritually lethal action of envy or jealousy. In comments on 7:4 both he (*Hom in Joannem* 48.2) and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 7:1–5) observe that envy is generally provoked by blood relationship. Erasmus has an adage to the same effect (not, however, echoed in the language of the paraphrase here): *Cognatio movet invidiam* 'Kinship stirs up envy,' *Adagia* IV viii 59, citing Aristotle *Rhetoric* 2.10 (1387b–1388a). Erasmus has here the similar idea that disrespect of Jesus is greater among his own people; cf Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 28.4, the interlinear *Gloss* (on 7:3) 207v: 'blood kin and so disdainful of him,' and the paraphrase on 4:44–5.

2 The Gospel text says that Jesus was 'walking' or 'going about' in Galilee;

Erasmus comments on this expression in the annotation on 7:1 (*in Galilaea est et in Iudaea;* the form of the lemma until 1535) that *ambulare* 'walk' is used in 7:1 for *versari* 'be in,' 'dwell in.' Accordingly here he says 'was staying in Galilee' (*versatus est*), and in the next sentence 'it was not then safe for him to live in Judea' (*vivere*).

3 In the annotation on 7:1 (*in Galilaea est et in Iudaea,* the form of the lemma until 1535) Erasmus quotes the passage from Chrysostom (*Hom in Joannem* 48.1) where Chrysostom discusses a text of 7:1 which says that Jesus 'was not able' to be in Judea, instead of the generally accepted reading, that he 'did not wish' to be in Judea. The paraphrase here accommodates either possibility, though Erasmus is careful, as Chrysostom also had been, to make clear that Jesus' inability is only in respect of his human nature and that no impairment of his divine capacities is implied.

91

4 Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 28.1, followed by the interlinear *Gloss* (on 7:1) 207v and Hugh of St Cher (on 7:1) 331v, says that Jesus is giving a model of justified flight from persecution, while Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 4 (on 7:1) PG 73 632C–633B says that the Evangelist means to allude to Jesus' eventual abandonment of the Jews and relocation among the gentiles; a similar but vague explanation is found in the marginal *Gloss* (on 7:1) 207v.

5 Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 28.3, as well as the *Gloss* (on 7:2) 207v and Hugh of St Cher (on 7:2) 331v, also explains the festival of Tabernacles as memorializing the years of wandering in the desert. Erasmus himself adapts the explanation of the festival to his theme of the behaviour of teachers of the gospel; cf the paraphrases on 2:24, on 4:8, on 6:3, 11, 13, 15, 66, on 8:11, and on 10:6–13.

6 'Syria' is a term for a geographical area differently defined at different times but usually including at least Phoenicia, Palestine, Judea, Idumea, Commagene, and Samaria. See OCD sv 'Syria.' What territory exactly Erasmus had in mind here is hard to say, except that it must include all the Jewish settlements and some that are not. Probably he is thinking of Syria as a Roman province; cf his remark in the annotation on Rom 1:1 (*Paulus*), where part of Syria is mentioned with Egypt and Cilicia as once under Alexander the Great and later under Roman administration.

7 'Relatives': *cognati,* though the Gospel text here says *fratres* 'brothers.' Erasmus makes the same change below, in the paraphrases on 7:5 and 7:10 (verses that also speak of 'brothers'), though there he uses the term 'brothers' as well. The relationship meant by the term 'brothers' in the Gospel here greatly concerned Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 28.3 and drew a passing remark from Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 7:1–5) and Nicholas of Lyra (on 7:3) 207v. Cf the paraphrase on 2:12, where Erasmus also uses both 'brothers' and 'relatives' while the Gospel text of 2:12 says 'brothers.'

8 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 48.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 7:1–5) also say that Jesus' relatives, over-confident in the privileges of kinship, are imputing cowardice and vainglory to him.

9 The end of Erasmus' sentence is very similar to the remarks of the interlinear *Gloss* (on 7:3) 207v: 'where the center of the nation is and the capital city of the kingdom.'

10 Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 4 (on 7:3–5) PG 73 636D–637B also says that while Jesus'

brothers did not believe in him at this point, some of them later became apostles, and were remarkable for their faith, and taught. Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 48.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 7:1–5) make the same point, and Chrysostom names James and Jude in particular (Acts 1:13, Gal 1:19).

92

11 Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 4 (on 7:8) PG 73 642C introduces here the idea of God's dissatisfaction with the ritual sacrifices of the law, quoting Amos 5:21–2.

12 For the addition of 'with you' cf the annotation on 7:8 (*ego enim non ascendam*), where Erasmus remarks that the Vulgate text 'for I will not go up' requires the addition of 'yet' to account for the 'not yet' of his Greek text and thus avoid the apparent lie, since Jesus did in fact go to the festival. He cites the authority of Chrysostom (*Hom in Joannem* 48.2), whose text reads 'I do not go up now' and who explains it as meaning 'I do not go up with you,' the interpretation Erasmus follows here. It is also found in Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 7:9, 10).

13 Cf the paraphrase on 2:4 and 12 and the notes there. In addition to the examples he had already used in that chapter, Erasmus here includes the address to Mary from the cross (19:26).

14 At this point Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 48.2 offered as a motive for Jesus' staying behind in Galilee his wish to conceal his divinity; Erasmus has already supplied another motive, but here also notes the alternation between evidence for the divinity and for the humanity of Christ, a theme he had last emphasized in the paraphrase on 5:19.

93

15 The conclusion that the favourable opinions were those of the common people, while the negative ones came from the priests and Pharisees, who would fear popular unrest because it threatened their position, is drawn by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 49.1 and repeated by Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 7:11–13) with additions, Hugh of St Cher (on 7:12) 332v (citing Chrysostom), and Nicholas of Lyra (on 7:12) 208r.

94

16 Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 7:14–16) says the question asked here by the Pharisees implies that they think Beelzebub is his source; the accusation is made openly at 7:20, but is not connected there with Jesus' scriptural knowledge.

17 Cf Matt 13:55 and the paraphrase on 6:42.

18 Cf 6:29, 30–4, 63, and the paraphrases on those passages. The *Gloss* (on 7:17) 208r has a note explaining that understanding of the teaching comes through believing.

19 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 49.1 also understands Jesus to be urging his hearers to rid themselves of such evils as envy, anger, and hatred, and thus see that Jesus' words are from God.

95

20 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 49.2, Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 4 (on 7:19, 20) PG 73 665B–C, and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 7:19, 20) all make the contrast

at this point between the Pharisees' accusation against Jesus of violating the Sabbath and their own murderous intentions.

21 Exod 23:7, quoted on this passage by Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 4 (on 7:19, 20) PG 73 665B–C; Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 7:19, 20) quotes the commandment forbidding murder, Exod 20:13 and Deut 5:17.

22 According to the text of 7:20, it is the crowd who reply to Jesus' question, not the Pharisees. Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 49.2, Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 4 (on 7:20) PG 73 668A–C, and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 7:19, 20) all speak of the respondents only as 'they,' though Cyril includes a general remark about Pharisees. Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 30.2 plays extensively on the perturbation of the *turba* 'crowd.' Apparently only Erasmus clearly identifies the respondents as Pharisees; but the identification is consistent with his portrayal in this chapter and frequently elsewhere in this *Paraphrase* of malice towards Jesus rising in direct relation to the status and professed religiosity of his hearers. Cf eg the paraphrases on 4:39–40 and 45; 5:1 and 47; and 7:45–50.

23 Lying is the traditional mark of the demon; cf 8:44.

24 That the Jews' reply is characterized by madness is noted also by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 49.2.

96

25 'Add fuel to their fire': *ne furorem adderet furentibus* 'add rage to the raging.' In spite of the adage-like sound of Erasmus' Latin expression (which he uses again in nearly the same form in the paraphrase on 11:54), it does not appear among a series of adages of similar meaning and form: *Malum malo medicari* 'To heal one evil with another,' *Morbum morbo addere* 'To add sickness to sickness,' *Ignem igni ne addas* 'Do not add fire to fire,' *Oleum camino addere* 'To pour oil on the fire,' *Oleo incendium restinguere* 'To quench fire with oil' (*Adagia* I ii 6–10).

26 This characterization of his reply is also made by Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 4 (on 7:21) PG 73 668C–669B.

27 Added from Matt 12:5

28 The paraphrase includes the 'why' of the contemporary Vulgate, though as Erasmus remarks in the annotation on 7:23 (*mihi cur indignamini*) there is no warrant for it in his Greek texts, where the question is simply 'Do you protest?'

29 Cf Acts 7:51, itself reminiscent of such passages as Jer 9:26.

30 Echoing a favourite expression of Augustine, who speaks of the periods of human history as three (or four when the period after the general resurrection is included), 'before the law, under the law, and under grace.' Cf Augustine *De diversis quaestionibus* 61.7, 66.3; and *Expositio quarundam propositionum ex Epistola ad Romanos* prop 13.

97

31 Cf Exod 23:3, Lev 19:15, Deut 1:17. The Exodus passage is quoted here by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 49.3 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 7:21–4), the Deuteronomy passage by Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 4 (on 7:24) PG 73 673A. (The text of Cyril available to Erasmus had a gap after discussion of 7:24. It did not resume again until the treatment of 12:49; cf translator's note xiii n9.)

32 'Quality of the person': *personae qualitatem* of the editions published in Erasmus' lifetime; LB VII 557D has the misleading misprint *personae aequalitatem.*

33 For the idea that the Gospel's 'some among the citizens of Jerusalem' indicates a segment of the general population corrupted by the Pharisees, cf Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 50.1.

34 Mic 5:2; cf below, the paraphrase on 7:42–3.

35 Erasmus' sentence is unsalvageable. He began with 'Jesus when he saw that their blindness was so great that,' but at this point has forgotten his original intention and started again with 'they' as the subject. The anacoluthon persists in all the editions printed in Erasmus' lifetime and in LB.

36 Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 31.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 7:25–7) quote Isa 53:8 in support of the idea that the messiah's origin is unknown, followed by the *Gloss* and Nicholas of Lyra (on 7:27) 208v–209r, and Hugh of St Cher (on 7:27) 334r. The Isaiah passage is referred by these commentators to the divine origin, while the contrasting passage, Mic 5:2, is the foundation for the immediately following paraphrase on Jesus' reply to this opinion.

98

37 For the treatment of the crowd as culpable because it deliberately chose to remain ignorant, cf Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 50.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 7:28, 29), both citing Tit 1:16; see n38 below.

38 Cf Tit 1:16, the passage mentioned here by Chrysostom and Theophylact, n37 above.

99

39 In this and the preceding two sentences Erasmus has reorganized the ideas in the Gospel text of 7:28 and 29. The sentence beginning 'I alone truly know him' paraphrases 7:29 as it appears in modern texts. The next one paraphrases 7:28b (RSV 'But I have not come of my own accord'). The last sentence paraphrases 7:28c. (The inference that since he who sent me is true, therefore I am also true is drawn by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 50.1.) As is clear from his remarks in the annotation on 7:29 (*ego scio eum et si dixero etc*) Erasmus' Vulgate text read 7:29 as follows: '*I know him; and if I say that I do not know him, I will be a liar like you. But* I know him, because I am from him, and he himself sent me.' The italicized portion has no counterpart, Erasmus says, in the Greek text or in his oldest Latin manuscripts. He suggests that it was added as a marginal gloss from 8:55 and thence crept into the text. While emphasizing an interpretation of Erasmus' preferred reading, the paraphrase accommodates this Vulgate reading by saying in the second of these three sentences 'teaching their own lies.'

40 Jesus' will and power as the elements that curb any violent outbreak against him at this point in his ministry are pointed out by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 50.2, Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 31.5–6 and 8, and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 7:30, 31).

41 The imperfect faith of the crowd is also noted by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 50.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 7:30, 31).

100

42 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 50.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem*

(on 7:32–6) say that the attendants were Jesus' intended targets in this speech.

43 'A wayfarer's provision of gospel faith': *viaticum evangelicae fidei*, a picturesque image that Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 51.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 7:37, 38) also use to describe Jesus' speech on the closing day of the festival; they speak of the speech as 'things for the road.'

101

44 Cf the paraphrase on chapter 6 (eg on 6:35, 46, 51).

45 In paraphrasing the Gospel text 'from his belly' Erasmus follows the observation of Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 51.1, Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 32.4, and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 7:37, 38) that 'belly' here is put for 'heart,' as in various Old Testament passages.

46 Erasmus' paraphrase closely follows his comments in the annotation on 7:38 (*qui credit in me, sicut dicit scriptura*). The Gospel text here reads 'whoever believes in me, as Scripture says, streams of living water will flow from his belly.' Erasmus reports Chrysostom's view (*Hom in Joannem* 51.1) that the clause 'as Scripture says' must be read with 'whoever believes in me,' since the following clause cannot be found in Scripture and should be understood as Jesus' own words.

47 At this point Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 51.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 7:37, 38) cite Stephen, Peter, and Paul as examples of the abundance of the gospel Spirit; the primary example of the apostles speaking in different languages is the Pentecost account, Acts 2.

48 'Some of them': *nonnulli*, the reading of the editions published in Erasmus' lifetime. LB VII 560D records this reading in a footnote but prints in its text *nonnulla*, giving 'they had perceived some of the elements.'

49 The paraphrase follows the contemporary Vulgate text of verse 39 in reading 'for the Sprit was not yet given.' Erasmus discusses in the annotation on 7:39 (*nondum erat spiritus datus*) the textual difference between this and his Greek manuscripts, which read 'the Holy Spirit was not yet.' Though he thinks the Greek text is authentic, he finds the Vulgate acceptable since the question at issue is the bestowal, not the existence, of the Spirit, as both Chrysostom (*Hom in Joannem* 51.1) and Theophylact (*Enarr in Joannem*, on 7:39) make clear by repeated reference to the giving of the Spirit in their remarks on this verse.

50 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 51.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 7:39) both say that the Evangelist is here calling the cross 'glory.'

51 Echoing the language of the creeds; cf such passages as Heb 10:12, 12:2.

52 For the contrast in this sentence between invitation on the one hand and on the other compulsion and exclusion in Jesus' words, cf Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 51.1, at the outset of his treatment of 7:37–44.

53 Cf Matt 16:6–12, Mark 8:15, Luke 12:1, 1 Cor 5:8.

102

54 For the despised position of Galilee, cf the paraphrases on 1:43 and 4:45–7.

55 The malice of the morally corrupted crowd, its wilful denial of what it did know about Jesus' birth, and its refusal to ask when it had the opportunity to do so are all noted by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 51.2; cf also Theophylact

Enarr in Joannem (on 7:40–3). Chrysostom implies and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 7:44–6) plainly states that it is one of Jesus' miracles that no one lays hands on him.

56 Cf Ps 7:14–16.

103

57 In this paragraph, and indeed to the end of the chapter, Erasmus develops the idea, also emphasized by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 52.1, Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 33.1, and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 7:44–6), of the moral and spiritual superiority of the uneducated common people to the highly trained and highly placed upper classes of the Jewish hierarchy. Augustine speaks of the Pharisees' blindness; Chrysostom points out that it took only a single speech by Jesus to turn the attendants' hearts and that they had the courage of their new convictions when they went back to the Pharisees. Erasmus makes use of both points.

58 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 52.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 7:47–51) also characterize the Pharisees' answer as mild, attributing the restraint to their wish not to alienate their subordinates.

59 It is not common for Erasmus to break the narrative in this paraphrase and address the reader so directly. This sentence drew fire from the Paris theologian Noël Béda as being an attack on contemporary monks and theologians. In the *Supputatio* LB IX 631B–E Erasmus replied to Béda's objections that the sentence must be understood in context, as spoken in the person of the Evangelist to readers of his own time, and that there certainly are virtuous monks and theologians; however, not all are so. The passage should not be taken, he says, as supplying support for Luther's misuse of Scripture for blanket condemnation of the institutional church, since Erasmus has himself criticised Luther for the same thing.

104

60 For the characterization of Nicodemus as a slow learner, cf the paraphrases on 3:1–21 and 4:10.

61 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 52.1 also notes Nicodemus' restraint in his reply, but without any suggestion that Nicodemus fears anything. Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 33.2 recalls Nicodemus in 3:1–21 as coming to Jesus by night because he was afraid his visit would be known; cf the paraphrase on 3:2.

62 In the annotation on 7:52 (*ex Galilaea propheta non surgit*) Erasmus says that the Vulgate present tense 'arises' in 'no prophet arises from Galilee' ought to be a perfect tense like the verb in the Greek text, and that the speakers are deducing from what has been true in the past what will also be true in the future. Hence the paraphrase 'has come or ever will come.'

63 For Erasmus' attitude towards 7:53–8:11, a passage of disputed authenticity, see the paraphrase on 8:1 n1 below.

Chapter 8

1 There has been a long-standing division between Eastern and Western Christianity on the authenticity of 7:53–8:11, dating at least to the time of

Augustine, Jerome, and the early Greek texts. The episode is not part of the Greek tradition but is found in the Latin tradition; cf Brown AB *John* 335–6 or other standard commentary for further details. Erasmus has a long annotation on 8:3 (*adducunt autem scribae et pharisaei mulierem*), in which he discusses the divergent Greek and Latin traditions, citing the fact that Chrysostom and Theophylact in their explications of this Gospel pass over the episode in silence, while Augustine both writes commentary on it and cites it in his other works. Erasmus adds that Jerome acknowledged it was not found in all the manuscripts, and that Eusebius thought it imported from an apocryphal gospel; he himself prefers, because of its standing in the Western tradition, not to remove it.

2 A return to the idea of Jesus' actions as exemplary for clergy in particular (also in the paraphrase on 8:11 below); cf the paraphrase on chapter 6 n6.

3 The corrupting influence of city life is a common theme of classical literature, as of the Christian and later Western tradition. The same opposition between the distracting and degrading wealth of cities and the search for truth in a simpler, more rural setting is expressed in such familiar works as Horace *Satires* 2.4 or Juvenal *Satires* 3; in the latter the narrator is moving permanently out of Rome to a backwater country town 'since there is no room in the city for honest talents' (21–2). Likewise Erasmus in the *Colloquies* can express similar sentiments: *Convivium religiosum* 'The Godly Feast' opens with an exchange between two of the participants on the numbers and kinds of people, 'including the very priests and monks themselves,' who crave city life for the opportunities it offers to get rich.

105

4 'Hunted for a handle': *venantur ansam*. Erasmus includes in his *Adagia* as I iv 4 *Ansam quaerere, et consimiles metaphorae* 'To look for a handle, and similar metaphors,' citing Plautus, Artistophanes, and Plato, among others.

5 Erasmus moves his full paraphrase on 8:5 ('But in the law Moses commanded us to stone such persons') here to the paraphrase on 8:3. His paraphrase does not state the law accurately, for it omits the fact that death by stoning was prescribed for both guilty parties (Lev 20:10, Deut 22:22). Nicholas of Lyra (on 8:3) 210v points out this feature of the law and proposes some reasons why the guilty man was not there.

6 The sharply drawn line between men and women here is unparalleled in Erasmus' sources. It may reflect the contrast of the more deadly sins of character and conscience revealed in the accusers' actions with the lesser sins, those defined by the law, which Erasmus treats here as not so lethal to spiritual welfare; cf also the paraphrase on 8:7–8 ('But when the Jews pressed him ...'). Cf the pervasive theme of the spiritual inferiority of those who claim greater spiritual authority, compared with humbler folk and those less learned in the law, eg the paraphrases on 4:45, 7:50, and 9 (especially 9:41).

7 The Paris theologian Noël Béda took issue with this sentence and the first half of the next one on the grounds that the law did in fact punish acts committed under the influence of such moral dispositions. Erasmus replied in the *Elenchus* LB IX 501B and the *Supputatio* LB IX 631E–632A that he is not discussing the actions that result from these sinful states but the secret sins themselves,

not punished by the law when they have not manifested themselves in actions.

8 This double-bind method for finding grounds for an accusation is noted by Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 33.4: Jesus will either advocate breaking the law or will betray the principle of gentleness that he has displayed until now. The *Gloss* (on 8:1) 210r, Hugh of St Cher (on 8:3) 336v, and Nicholas of Lyra (on 8:6) 210v also follow Augustine. Erasmus' sentence is actually the paraphrase on 8:6, inserted here before the paraphrase on 8:4–5.

9 The paraphrase on 8:4 omits the address 'teacher' found in the Gospel text.

10 Cf Matt 5:17.

11 Cf eg 3:17 and Luke 9:56.

106

12 'Sink down within themselves': *ut in se descenderent*. Erasmus lists *in se descendere* 'to venture down within oneself' as an adage meaning 'to contemplate one's own faults,' *Adagia* I vi 86, and describes it as derived from underground storage pits or cellars, because the people who go down into them can find out what they contain. Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 33.5 also regards Jesus' physical action here as modelling spiritual self–examination.

13 Cf eg Matt 6:12 and 14–15, Luke 11:4, Matt 18:21–35.

14 Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 33.5 also contrasts the law written on stone with the law written on the ground, opposing the hardness of the former to the fruitfulness of the latter.

15 'Is free from sin': *est immunis a peccato*. Erasmus comments in the annotation on 8:7 (*sine peccato est*) that the Greek word ἀναμάρτητος 'sinless,' translated by the Vulgate as *sine peccato* 'without sin,' means 'not only one who has not sinned, but one who cannot sin,' citing in support Jerome *Dialogus adversus Pelagianos* 2.17.

107

16 This clause paraphrases a Greek text, not the Vulgate. As Erasmus points out in an annotation on 8:9 (*audientes autem hoc unus post unum*), the Vulgate text 'hearing this they went out one by one' omits what he found in his Greek manuscripts, which read 'hearing this and found guilty by their consciences, they went out one by one' (for this reading in modern texts, cf Nestle-Aland 26th ed). He concedes that Valla in his *Annotationes* (842) read without the added phrase.

17 'And the rest following behind' also represents what Erasmus found in his Greek texts (cf n16 above). He notes that the Greeks add to the Vulgate 'from the eldest' the phrase 'to the last': see the annotation on 8:9 (*a senioribus*).

18 For 'pillars of piety and justice' cf Gal 2:9, Rev 3:12, and the quite common metaphorical use of 'pillar' in the same way in classical and post-classical Latin and Greek.

19 Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 33.5 and the *Gloss* (on 8:8) 210v, followed by Hugh of St Cher (on 8:8) 337r suggest that Jesus' second writing on the ground is a deliberate withdrawal of his attention from his hearers' reaction to his response. Augustine says that Jesus did not deign to look at them; the *Gloss*, that he turned his gaze away to give them the opportunity to leave.

20 Cf Ezek 18:23 and 32, 33:11. Nicholas of Lyra (on 8:3) 210v cites Ezek 18:23.

21 For Erasmus' treatment of Jesus' actions as examples specifically for the clergy, see n2 above. The application of this example to those with the power of judgment, not only or specifically clerics, is made by the *Gloss* (on 8:1) 210r and Hugh of St Cher (on 8:9) 337r. Nicholas of Lyra (on 8:11) 210v discusses particular points at which the priest is *not* to follow Jesus' example in exempting confessed sinners from the penitential process.

22 Erasmus here makes a close connection between the episode of the woman taken in adultery and the following words of Jesus 'I am the light of the world' (8:12) by interpreting that remark to refer to the forgiveness of sins as just illustrated by his action. The interpretation of the juncture is that of the *Gloss* (on 8:12) 210v, and more elaborately Hugh of St Cher (on 8:12) 337v, who cites both the version of Chrysostom (who joins 8:12 directly to 7:52; see n1 above) and that of the *Gloss*. There is also, however, a strong similarity in the paraphrase on 8:12 to the thought of Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 52.2, who identifies sin here as error and refers to 3:20; see also Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 7:52–8:12) and the paraphrase on 3:19–21.

23 'Are eager to appear as exactly what they are': *nec aliud videri student quam sunt*, suggesting the proverbial figure quoted from Aeschylus by Plato in *Republic* 2.361B, 'the man who does not want to appear but to be good.' Cf Sallust *Bellum Catilinae* 54.6: *esse quam videri bonus malebat* '[Cato] preferred to be rather than to appear good.'

108

24 Here too cf Plato *Republic* 2.361A: 'the height of injustice is to seem to be just when one is not'; the same thought is expressed in Cicero *De officiis* 1.41. See n23.

25 A proverbial idea familiar to the Evangelists: Matt 15:14 and 23:16 and 24, Luke 6:39. In *Adagia* I viii 40: *Caecus caeco dux* 'The blind leading the blind' Erasmus mentions that it is common in the Gospels and cites classical occurrences from Cicero *De finibus* (a mistake for *Tusculan Disputations* 5.112), Horace (*Epistles* 1.17.3–4), and Aristophanes *Plutus* (13–16).

26 In these words Erasmus is adapting the rhetorical emphasis of Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 52.2, who says on the phrase 'light of the world' 'not of Galilee, not of Palestine, not of Judea.' Hugh of St Cher (on 8:12) 337v, following the same precedent, says 'not only of Galilee, not of Palestine'; the same point is made by Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 7:52–8:12).

27 Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 34.2 also compares the 'light of the world' to the sun in the sky. Cf also the paraphrases on 9:5, 12:35, 12:46.

28 Cf Prov 27:2, quoted by Hugh of St Cher (on 8:13) 338r.

29 Cf 2 Tim 2:14.

30 Cf 5:33 and 39, and in general the paraphrase on 5:31–40.

109

31 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 52.2 and Hugh of St Cher (on 8:14) 338r point out here the volitional nature of the Pharisees' ignorance.

32 This is also the explanation in Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 36.4 for 8:16 'I judge no one,' which otherwise appears to contradict such passages as 5:22.

110

33 'We are two': *duo sumus*. The terminology was criticized by the Paris theologian Noël Béda because he understood it to say 'We are two entities,' in other words to be an assault on orthodox trinitarianism. In the *Elenchus* LB IX 501B–C and more fully in the *Supputatio* LB IX 632A–633C Erasmus defends himself on the grounds that the Evangelist is speaking about numbers of witnesses, not about the essence of divinity; and that the statement must be evaluated in terms of the context and dramatic situation of its speaker and hearers. Béda had also taken exception to Erasmus' speaking of God the Father in a contrary-to-fact or unreal conditional sentence ('Yet of the two ...'). Erasmus points out that such grammatical structures are permitted even in scholastic logic and in school exercises.

34 Cf 14:8–9.

35 Erasmus is paraphrasing the Greek, not the Vulgate text, which includes a 'perhaps' in this clause. But as he points out in the annotation on 8:19 (*forsitan et patrem*) the Vulgate translator has again overtranslated the Greek potential particle ἄν by an adverb suggesting a degree of uncertainty that is not present in the Greek original.

36 Cf Num 18:8–24.

111

37 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 53.1, Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 37.9, and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 8:19, 20) say that Jesus was not taken prisoner at this point because his necessary consent to his own death was lacking.

38 'You will yearn for me when I am gone': *absentem desideratis*. The word in 8:21 being paraphrased is simply *quaeretis* 'you will seek.' Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 38.2 understands this in a hostile sense; they will seek him 'not out of yearning but hatred.' Augustine's view is followed by the *Gloss* and Nicholas of Lyra (on 8:21) 211r. But Hugh of St Cher (on 8:21) 339r, while offering this interpretation as one possibility and mentioning the Roman destruction of Jerusalem as the penalty suffered for Jewish persecution of Jesus and his followers, also suggests the alternative view (or perhaps consequence) that they will repent too late and seek for him when he is no longer available. Cf also 12:35–6 and the paraphrase on 9:4.

39 Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 38.2 had argued from the sequence of the text at 8:21 'you will seek me and you will die in your sin' for the hostile sense of 'seek' described in n38. By saying here 'if you persist in your unbelief' Erasmus has proposed a different connection between 'you will seek' and 'you will die in your sin,' one that looks more towards the possibility of conversion among the Pharisees and towards the urgency of Jesus' appeal to them.

40 The two points specified here as the contents of the puzzling statement are also given by Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 8:21–4).

112

41 The paraphrase does not treat 8:24 'if you do not believe that I am, you will die' as an example of Jesus' use of the divine affirmation 'I am,' as found in Exod 3:14 and in this Gospel at 8:58; cf the paraphrase there. It is so taken by Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 38.8, followed by the *Gloss* (on 8:24) 211v and

alluded to by Hugh of St Cher (on 8:25) 339v, but not by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 53.1 or Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 8:21–4).

42 The Gospel text of Jesus' answer in 8:25 and its interpretation are notoriously difficult; see Brown AB *John* 347–8 or any other standard commentary. The difficulty was exacerbated by the contemporary Vulgate translation, as Erasmus points out in the annotation on 8:25 (*principium qui et loquor*), for the word *principium* 'beginning,' intended to represent the Greek adverbial accusative τὴν ἀρχήν 'in the first place' was taken by the Latins (notably Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 38.11, 39.1, 40.1) as nominative or a subjective use of the accusative, 'I am the beginning,' hence as the answer to the question 'Who are you?' and as having metaphysical meaning related to 1:1 and Gen 1:1. In accordance with the detailed discussion in the annotation, Erasmus dismisses all trace of *principium* from the *Paraphrase on John*. But establishment of the Greek text does not clear up the ambiguity, as the annotation goes on to explain, detailing four possible interpetations, depending on how the Greek words are punctuated and how they are to be related to their context. Erasmus' solution in the paraphrase relies conceptually on the explanations of Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 53.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 8:25–7), which he had cited in the annotation; it also, however, draws on 8:24 and Augustine's strong emphasis in *Tract in Joannem* 38.10 on the priority of belief to knowledge and understanding.

43 Cf Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 53.1, who alludes here to 3:17 and 12:47, and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 8:25–7).

44 'He was speaking of his heavenly Father': this is also the interpretation that Erasmus gives in the annotation on 8:27 (*quia patrem eius dicebat deum*) for a Vulgate text that read 'because he called God his father.' He explains there that the Greek texts do not include a word equivalent to the Latin *deum* 'God' and do read 'to them' instead of the Vulgate 'his.' Erasmus cites Chrysostom (*Hom in Joannem* 53.1) as giving the same interpretation; cf also Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 8:25–7).

113

45 'Who I am': *qui sim*. The Vulgate text of verse 28 translates the Greek ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι as *quia ego sum* 'because/that I am,' but as Erasmus was well aware ὅτι could also be read as 'what.' That is how he understood Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 53.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 8:28, 29) to have read it, both of whom go on to say 'that is, the Christ, the Son of God.' The paraphrase here follows the Greek commentators in taking the phrase to mean 'who I am' rather than 'that I am,' thus not treating the verse as containing the divine affirmation; cf n41.

46 The imperfect faith of these new believers is also noted by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 53.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 8:30–2).

47 Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 40.9 includes in his discussion of this passage a long consideration of the priority of faith to understanding.

48 The future tense of 'I will acknowledge' represents the future tense in the Vulgate 'you will truly be my disciples,' though Erasmus reported in the annotation on 8:31 (*vere discipuli mei eritis*) that his Greek texts had the present tense both here and in verse 36 'you will truly be free' (where Erasmus' paraphrase also maintains the Vulgate's future tense).

49 The idea of the law as a figure or shadow is introduced here by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 54.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 8:30–2).

50 Cf 1 Cor 7:20–4 and perhaps also such passages as Eph 6:5–9 and Col 3:22–5.

114

51 'Were swollen with pride': *tumebant;* Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 41.3 remarks on the Jews' answer here: *Non est ista magnitudo sed tumor* 'This is not grandeur but swelled-headedness.'

52 Cf Mark 7:3–4.

53 Cf the paraphrase on 7:23 n29.

54 'Their deeds not their dress': *factis non phylacteriis;* Erasmus is playing with the punning sounds of the two words. Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 53.3, in the exhortatory close to his sermon on 8:20–30, describes the Jewish custom of wearing phylacteries and urges his congregation to wear the scripture written on their hearts. Cf Jer 31:33, Rom 2:14–15.

55 This evaluation of the relative weights of ignorance and slavery is found in Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 54.1, Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 8:33–6), Hugh of St Cher (on 8:33) 340v (citing Chrysostom), and Nicholas of Lyra (on 8:33) 212r.

56 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 54.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 8:33–6) also point out the incapacity of slaves to bestow freedom, citing Heb 5:1–3.

115

57 According to Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 54.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 8:33–6), in the statement of 8:35 that 'the slave does not abide in the house forever,' while 'the son abides in the house,' 'abide' means 'have power.'

58 For the insufficiency of the freedom from sin obtained by Jewish ritual traditions, cf Chrysostom and Theophylact cited in n56.

59 The example of Abraham and Isaac (Gen 22; cf Heb 11:17–19) here anticipates its reappearance in the paraphrase on 8:56, where its connection with the coming crucifixion is made more explicit.

60 Erasmus makes a similar observation – 'in general we call anyone the son of him whom he reflects in character' – in his discussion of the adage *Patris est filius* 'he's his father's son' (*Adagia* IV iii 36). Cf the paraphrase on 3:6 and n16.

61 'The parents' model ... passes into the character of the children': *abit enim exemplum parentum ... in mores filiorum.* For the expression cf Livy 1.32.2 *facta spes in avi mores atque instituta regem abiturum* 'a hope arose that the king would develop into the character and habits of his grandfather,' or, less likely, Pseudo-Ovid *Heroides* 15.83 *abeunt studia in mores* 'interests develop into habits.'

62 The same purpose is attributed to them by Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 42.3. Erasmus does not actually give a version of the Jews' reply in 8:39, 'Our father is Abraham'; the reply is implicit, however, in Jesus' words below, 'Now though you boast endlessly about your father Abraham.'

116

63 In 'if you wish' and in the imperative verb forms 'reflect' and 'believe,' Erasmus paraphrases the contemporary Vulgate text of 8:39: 'If you are sons

of Abraham, do the works of Abraham.' However, as he notes in the annotation on 8:39 (*si filii Abrahae estis*) his Greek texts have not a simple condition with an imperative but a contrary-to-fact conditional sentence and should have been translated that way into Latin: 'If you were sons of Abraham, you would do the works of Abraham.'

64 Cf Gen 15:6, Rom 4:3 and 22.

65 Exod 4:22, quoted by Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 8:39–41); Jer 31:9. The interlinear *Gloss* (on 8:41) 212v also notes that God called Israel his first-born.

66 Cf 1:47 and the paraphrase on 19:19 and n34.

67 'And speaks' is the reading of the editions published in Erasmus' lifetime, but LB VII 571D reads illogically 'and I speak.'

68 Erasmus has recast as a question what appears in 8:43 as the answer to the preceding question: 'Why do you not recognize my voice? Because you are unable to hear my words.'

117

69 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 54.3 calls envy the devil's motive in the Garden of Eden; Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 42.10 says pride was the reason for his fall from truth, as Erasmus does also in what follows. All Erasmus' usual sources treat the text here as alluding to the sin of Adam and Eve.

70 Cf 15:26.

71 In the annotation on 8:46 (*arguet me de peccato*) Erasmus points out that the Vulgate future verb *arguet* 'will charge' ought to be present tense, like the Greek verb it translates; that the simple verb is put for the Greek modal expression 'can convict'; and that *convincere* 'convict' is the verb that should have been used instead of *arguere*, since that is what the Greek verb means. Here he adds the modal expression and changes the verb altogether: *possit impingere* 'can make ... stick.'

72 That the Jews' answer is an emotional evasion of the logical case against them is also noted by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 55.1 and Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 43.1.

118

73 'Mushroom-head or onion-head': *fungum ... aut bulbum. Fungus* 'mushroom' is a term of abuse as early as Plautus *Bacchides* 283, 1088; citing Plautus, Erasmus included it in the *Adagia* (IV i 38: *Fungus*), where he says this term is used 'for a stupid and immoderately credulous person, either because a mushroom by itself is a tasteless thing, or because it is soft and easily crushed, or because it pops out suddenly.' He made much use of it himself, eg in the colloquies *Epithalamium Petri Aegidii* 'The Epithalamium of Pieter Gillis' ASD I-3 414:111, and *Merdardus* ASD I-3 653:3–4; *De conscribendis epistolis* ASD I-2 245:3–8; Ep 1219 (to Mountjoy in 1521, describing Luther). *Bulbus* 'bulb' of all kinds but including onions, does not appear in the abusive vocabulary of classical Latin; Erasmus may be thinking of Cicero *Pro Cluentio* 71, where Cicero makes some unkind jokes about salad and oil in reference to the name of his opponent's associate, one Bulbus.

74 The gentleness of Jesus' responses in this interchange with the Jews, and their function as exemplars of the way in which we should vigorously defend

God's truth and overlook insult to ourselves, are noted by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 55.1, Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 43.1–2, and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 8:46–50).

75 'Belief alone is the road and entryway to immortality': *sola credulitas via est et aditus ad immortalitatem.* This sentence appeared in the 1523 and 1524 editions of the *Paraphrase on John* as 'belief alone is the road to immortality.' In the 1534 edition Erasmus added *et aditus.* The Paris theologian Noël Béda criticized the original version as Lutheranizing; Erasmus replied in the *Divinationes* LB IX 482E–483A, the *Elenchus* LB IX 501C–D, and the *Supputatio* LB IX 633C–D. The gist of his defence was that *sola* 'alone' does not exclude good works, which follow naturally on faith as leaves and fruit on a tree, and that he put *via* for *aditus* 'entryway' meaning the beginning of the road, not its entirety. The Paris faculty of theology was not satisfied and included the sentence in its *Censurae* of 1530; Erasmus' 1532 reply, on this and other passages, in the *Declarationes ad censuras Lutetiae vulgatas* LB IX 847A–849C adds to the earlier arguments the argument from context, which shows or should show that he is speaking here only of those not yet baptized. For similar difficulties cf the paraphrase on chapter 4 n40.

76 The distinction made here between the two kinds of life or death is noted by the interlinear *Gloss* and Nicholas of Lyra (on 8:51) 213r, and by Hugh of St Cher (on 8:51) 343v.

119

77 For this and the two preceding sentences, paraphrasing the last sentence of 8:55, 'But I know him and I keep his word,' cf Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 8:53–5), who says that by λόγος 'word' here commandments are meant, but that some understand the sentence to be referring to the word as the means of identity between Father and Son: 'I keep his word in me as it is in him.' So Erasmus says *quicquid mandavit* 'whatever command he has given' but reverts to *sermo(nes)* 'word(s)' in the following two sentences (*sermo* is also the word used in the Vulgate text and one theologically significant to Erasmus; cf the paraphrase on chapter 1 n16).

120

78 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 55.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 8:56–9) comment that the story of Abraham and Isaac prefigures the crucifixion and that the 'day' Abraham foresaw was the day of the crucifixion.

79 The connection between Jesus' statement and the divine affirmation is made by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 55.2 and by Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 8:56–9), who adds the quotation from Exod 3:14.

80 'Was born': *nasceretur.* Though in the annotation on 8:58 (*antequam Abraham fieret*) Erasmus had preferred a change of vocabulary from the Vulgate translator's *fieret* 'came into being' to *esset* or *fuisset* 'existed,' 'was' as the translation of the Greek γενέσθαι 'be,' 'become,' 'come into being,' 'be born,' here he paraphrases 'was born,' making a stronger contrast between the temporality of mortal existence and the eternity of divine existence.

81 The abandonment of incorrigible Jews and the resettlement of the gospel among the gentiles, a favourite theme of Erasmus' in this paraphrase – eg

the paraphrases on 2:10; 4:3, 40, 45; and 7:1 – is pointed out as the typological meaning of Jesus' departure from the temple by the *Gloss* (on 8:59) 213v and Hugh of St Cher (on 8:59) 344r.

Chapter 9

121

1 The same turning from words to actions in the form of miracles is underlined here by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 56.1.

2 'The eyes of the mind': *mentis oculos*. Cf the 'eyes of your heart' Eph 1:18 and the ubiquitous Old and New Testament references to eyes as metaphors for spiritual understanding and blindness for spiritual ignorance or wickedness. Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 56.1 also specifically says here that the blind man had 'inner eyes.' The image of the eyes of the mind, or heart, or faith is common in the *Paraphrase on John* as elsewhere in Erasmus' work; in this chapter it occurs very frequently as part of the sight/blindness polarity. For other examples cf the preface to this *Paraphrase* in chapter 1, 13 above, and 'To the pious reader' 226 below.

3 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 56.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 9:1, 2) also attribute to the disciples a comparison between the situation of the paralytic in chapter 5 and the blind man here.

4 Cf 5:14.

5 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 56.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 9:1, 2) illustrate the Old Testament foundation for refutation of the disciples' belief that the sins of the fathers are visited on the children (Exod 20:5, Deut 5:9) by quoting Deut 24:16, 2 Kings 14:6, Ezek 18:2–4 (or Jer 31:30) and explaining that the Exodus and Deuteronomy passages refer only to those who imitate the sins of their fathers. See the next note.

6 The Paris theologian Noël Béda raised two objections here, the first to the previous sentence, because it is contrary to such passages as Exod 20:5, 34:7, and Deut 5:9, and the second to the attribution in this sentence of the man's blindness to *casu quopiam* 'some accident,' because the providence of God is thereby denied. Erasmus replied (with some heat) that he is following the interpretation of Chrysostom and Theophylact, who demonstrate the kind of reconciliation necessary between apparently conflicting passages of Scripture (cf n5). As for the matter of God's providence and accident or chance, he says, leaving aside the Aristotelian treatment of chance, in Latin *casus* is used for whatever happens outside our intention or expectation; what is chance to us because we do not know the causes is not chance to the providential God: *Divinationes* LB IX 483A–C, *Elenchus* LB IX 501D–E, *Supputatio* LB IX 633D–634A. The previous sentence was still included in the 1530 *Censurae* of the Paris faculty of theology as being heretical because it denies the temporal punishment of children for their fathers' sins, whereas orthodoxy declares only that such children are spared eternal punishment. Erasmus replied in the *Declarationes ad censuras Lutetiae vulgatas*, as he had before, that he was basing his view on that of Chrysostom and Theophylact, 'approved Doctors of the church,' and that not all external calamity is punishment (LB IX 904A–F).

7 According to the interpretation of the syntax of 9:3 given by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 56.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 9:3–5), the declaration to humankind of the power and goodness of God is the result, not the cause, of the man's blindness. Erasmus cites their reading of 9:3 in the *Divinationes* LB IX 483A–B; cf the preceding note.

122

8 Cf 7:33–4, 8:21, 13:33.

9 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 56.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 9:3–5) say that the work referred to in 9:4 is believing; cf also the paraphrase on 6:29.

10 'That person's sun has then set': *iam illi dies suus occidit*, perhaps a reminiscence of Catullus 5.5–6: *Nobis cum semel occidit brevis lux, nox est perpetua una dormienda* 'When once our brief light has set, there is one endless night to sleep.'

11 The typological connection between Jesus' making mud and healing the blind man, and the creation of humankind as told in Gen 2:7, is pointed out by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 56.2, Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 9:6–7), the *Gloss* and Nicholas of Lyra (on 9:6) 214r, and Hugh of St Cher (on 9:6) 345v.

123

12 Cf Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 72.3 (on 14:10–14): 'Consider whether it is a greater thing to create the righteous or to make the sinful righteous.'

13 That the blind man's faith and trust is shown by his unquestioning compliance with Jesus' unusual treatment and instructions is pointed out by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 56.2 and 57.1, Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 9:6–7), and Nicholas of Lyra (on 9:6) 214r. Chrysostom and Theophylact say that this is one reason for sending the man to Siloam to wash, and another is to make the miracle known to more people, who would see him as he went by and would be curious at the strange sight.

14 This topographical detail is recorded in Jerome *Commentarii in Esaiam* 3 CCL 73 113 (on Isa 8:5–8) and is repeated by the *Gloss* (on 9:7) 214r. For the influence of Jerome on the whole passage, see nn17 and 18 below.

15 Isa 8:6

16 This translator's insertion attempts to express what Erasmus evidently meant to say, though the Latin text in every edition continues with only a comma between 'they were scorned' and the remainder of the sentence from 'not because anyone obtained.'

17 Cf Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 57.1, 'There was no need to suspect that Siloam would get the glory. For many had often bathed their eyes there and had experienced no such thing,' and Jerome *Commentarii in Esaiam* 3 CCL 73 113 (on Isa 8:5–8), 'Now God speaks to the prophet in a familiar figure for Scripture, through the metaphor of the spring of Siloam at Jerusalem.' Cf nn14 and 18. Erasmus is well acquainted with the metaphorical use of water for Scripture; eg in the *Enchiridion* CWE 66 32 he says 'It is common for the Holy Spirit to use the symbol of water to signify knowledge of the divine law'; he then goes on to give a number of examples of the practice from the Old Testament, and three from the Gospel of John: the well-water of chapter 4, the pool of Siloam in this episode, and the water in the foot-washing episode in chapter 13.

18 'Although they flow calmly and gently far from the racket of worldly

eloquence': *quae cum absque strepitu mundanae eloquentiae placide leniterque fluant.* Cf the language of Jerome *Commentarii in Esaiam* 3 CCL 73 114 (on Isa 8:5–8). In reference to this episode in the Gospel of John, Jerome describes the teaching of Christ's waters, *quae absque strepitu et clamore verborum leniter fluit* 'which flows gently far from the racket and noise of words.' The same words are quoted by the *Gloss* (on 9:7) 214r, with an allusion to the Isaiah passage. Jerome had already called Siloam a metaphor for Scripture (n17 above) and had described its topography (n14 above). Part of the topographical description is the statement that the spring 'comes through hollows in the earth and caverns of very hard rock,' which apparently influences Erasmus' reference to 'caverns of divine wisdom' in this sentence. Jerome says that the present episode shows that 'the blindness of the Jews and all unbelievers cannot be healed unless the darkness of earlier error is put to flight by the teaching of Christ's waters' described in the words quoted above; Erasmus concludes his sentence with a similar thought.

19 Erasmus adds the assignment to Syrian of the word Siloam, already translated in the text of 9:7 as 'sent.'

20 Erasmus here uses the typological explanation of Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 57.1, Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 9:6–7), the *Gloss* (on 9:7) 214r, and Hugh of St Cher (on 9:7) 346r, who say that Siloam is a figure for Christ; for the identity of Christ, word, and Scripture elsewhere, cf eg the paraphrase on 1:1, and on 6:35, 51, 70.

21 Erasmus' paraphrase is on a text that reads 'the neighbours and those who had seen him before'; the contemporary Vulgate read 'neighbours who had seen,' but as Erasmus said in the annotation on 9:8 (*vicini qui viderant*) there was an 'and' in the Greek and in the oldest Latin manuscripts between 'neighbours' and 'who had seen.'

22 In saying 'beggar' instead of 'blind man' Erasmus' paraphrase follows his observation in the annotation on 9:8 (*quia mendicus erat*) that although the Greek has 'blind man,' he prefers the unanimous reading of the Latin manuscripts and Augustine (*Tract in Joannem* 44.8) as being more appropriate to the sense here, since it is because he was a beggar that he was well known (a point also made by Nicholas of Lyra [on 9:8] 214r, who makes no mention of the alternate reading). Cf Nestle-Aland 26th edition for the modern Greek text, which reads 'beggar.'

124

23 In the editions of 1523 and 1524 this sentence read 'So the Pharisees again asked the man for they knew how he had become able to see ...'

24 'The facts themselves say': *res ipsa loquitur*; cf the paraphrase on chapter 3 n5 for this near-proverbial expression.

25 The paraphrase changes only the verb of the Vulgate text ('think' instead of 'say'), even though in the annotation on 9:17 (*de eo qui aperuit tibi oculos*) Erasmus explained that the Greek says, 'What do you say about the man, since he opened your eyes?' not 'who opened your eyes'; thus the question calls for a conclusion from the action.

26 The probability is that Jesus is meant here by 'as he knew,' since his divine knowledge of the secrets of human hearts is a recurring motif in the *Paraphrase on John*, but the referent is no clearer in Latin than in English.

125

27 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 58.1 also remarks that the Pharisees' efforts to discredit the miracle only add to its glory.

28 Here and twice more in this episode (the paraphrases on 9:26 and 9:40, 126 and 128 below) Erasmus employs *Adagia* I iv 4: *Ansam quaerere, et consimiles metaphorae* 'To look for a handle, and similar metaphors.' Cf the paraphrase on 8:3 and n4 there.

29 In paraphrasing the Vulgate text of 9:21 'let him speak' with 'let him say' Erasmus does not pursue the point he had made in the annotation on 9:21 (*de se loquatur*), that the Greek verb is not 'let him speak' but 'he will speak,' future indicative.

30 In the annotation on 9:22 (*extra synagogam fieret*) Erasmus had already pointed out that the literal meaning of the word in the Greek text is *alienus a congregatione* 'estranged from the congregation,' 'which is commonly called excommunicated.'

126

31 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 58.2 says that the corollary to the Pharisees' urging the man in 9:24 to give glory to God is that he is to admit Jesus is not responsible for his healing.

32 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 58.2 also uses a hunting image when he describes the Pharisees in 9:26 as 'like those from every side tracking a wild beast in its lair and shutting it in.'

33 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 58.2–3 notes the increasing confidence and courage of the beggar in his reply to this round of the Pharisees' questions; both Chrysostom and Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 44.11 say that in this reply he includes himself among Jesus' disciples by implication, an implication that Erasmus makes explicit.

34 Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 44.12 points out that what the Pharisees intend as a curse is actually something very desirable to the believer.

127

35 'Argued Jesus' case, deducing and demonstrating': *illius causam agit … colligens et convincens*. Erasmus' language is suddenly that of the rhetorical schools (where the logic of formal debate was taught) and the lawcourts. Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 58.3 also comments on this speech of the beggar in the language of rhetoric: *συλλογίζεται* 'he argues in the logical mode.' The comment is picked up by Hugh of St Cher (on 9:30) 346v, who uses the same verb in its Latin form *syllogizat*.

36 In the annotation on 9:31 (*peccatores deus non audit*) Erasmus notes that the Vulgate translator has used two different Latin words, *audire* 'hear' and *exaudire* 'hear,' 'heed' to translate what is the same verb in Greek; he warns the unwary reader of the Vulgate not to find any mystical meaning in the change of verbs. So here in the paraphrase he uses *audire* for both 'God does not *hear* the prayers of sinners' and 'God *hears* him.'

37 This sentence, which does not represent any words of the Gospel text, in form and content is the specific conclusion from the general rule in the preceding sentence. That sentence paraphrases the second statement in 9:31, also a general rule: 'If anyone is a worshipper of God and does his will, God

hears him.' Hugh of St Cher (on 9:30) 346v remarks that the beggar 'intends a conclusion to be drawn, but he leaves the conclusion to them, ie that from the fact that God hears him, he is not a sinner.' Erasmus adds the final step in the deduction.

38 'To the creation of the world': *ab orbe condito*, a phrase of striking resemblance to *ab urbe condita* 'from the founding of the city,' a standard way of referring to dates in the classical Roman system of chronology and famous particularly as the title in common use since antiquity of the history of Rome by Livy.

39 The text of 9:34 has the Pharisees saying only 'You were born entirely in sin, and you teach us?' Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 58.3 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 9:34–8) interpret the accusation as being based on his blindness; Erasmus adds to the blindness the beggar's poverty as evidence in the Pharisees' mind of his spiritual worthlessness.

40 The contrast between the Pharisees' ban and Christ's reception is made at this point by Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 44.15: 'They drive him out, the Lord receives him' (similarly at 44.10), and by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 59.1: 'He was driven from the pestilential synagogue and came upon the salvific spring.'

41 Directly after the sentence quoted in the previous note, Chrysostom goes on in an elaboration of the ironies of honour and dishonour in the Pharisees' ban: 'He was dishonoured by those who dishonour Christ, and he was honoured by the Lord of the angels.' Erasmus elaborates the ironies even further in this sentence, where each clause of its quadruple structure makes an ever more complex ironic statement of the contrast, until it ends in quiet simplicity with an allusion to part of the Beatitudes, Matt 5:10–11. Nicholas of Lyra (on 9:34) 215r quotes the Matthew passage here.

128

42 'You there': *heus tu*, a form of address commonly used by Roman comic playwrights, satirists, and others in a familiar conversational mode of speech.

43 'Lord': *domine*, 'Lord' or 'sir.' Cf the paraphrase on chapter 4 n21.

44 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 59.1 also underlines the importance of the beggar's act here confirming his words.

45 Cf 9:5.

46 The Gospel text of 9:40 does not explicitly impugn the motives of these Pharisees in their attendance on Jesus; that they are not sincere or deeply committed is the explanation offered by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 59.2 and repeated by Hugh of St Cher (on 9:40) 348r. For the proverbial nature of 'handle' in this sentence, cf n28 above.

129

47 The familiar proverb again; cf the paraphrase on John 8 n25.

Chapter 10

1 'Shepherds of the people' is particularly the language used of the leaders of Israel in Ezek 34, who are there criticized by the prophet for serving their own interests instead of the people's. Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 60.1 and

Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 45.11 both quote from parts of the Ezekiel chapter in their discussions of later parts of this parable; Hugh of St Cher (on 10:2) 348v does the same, but at the outset of his treatment of the episode.

2 'Metaphors': *similitudines;* according to the preface to this *Paraphrase* in chapter 1, 13, one of the ways we try, though unsuccessfully, to speak about God. Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 59.2, Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 45.2, and Hugh of St Cher (on 10:1) 348v all comment at the outset of their treatment of the chapter that Jesus is making use here of metaphor. Augustine returns to the subject in *Tract in Joannem* 46.3 and 47.2; in discussing the difference between the metaphors for Christ and the properties of Christ, he lists many metaphors for Christ found in both the Old and New Testaments. Erasmus confines himself in the rest of the present sentence to the metaphors Jesus himself had used in this Gospel. See next note. For Erasmus' view of the function of figurative language in Scripture, cf eg *Ratio* LB V 117A–120C.

3 Cf 6:35 (bread), 4:14 and 7:37–8 (water), 8:12 (light), 5 *passim* and 7:18 (Son and deputy); 'deputy' (*legatus*) is Erasmus' own word in eg the paraphrase on 5:42, not the language of Scripture, which speaks of 'the one who was sent.' For 'Son' as metaphor, cf the preface to this *Paraphrase* in chapter 1, 15–16.

4 *Parabola* 'parable' is used for extended comparisons in Erasmus' *De copia* CWE 24 621–3, where it is translated 'parallel,' and in the work called *Parabolae sive similia* CWE 23 123–277. In the dedicatory letter to the latter work, Erasmus says (130:28–9): 'For the Greek *parabolê* ... is nothing more than a metaphor writ large.' See also n14 below.

5 Cf Heb 13:20.

130

6 Cf Matt 25:31–3.

7 Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 45.5 says that those who enter the sheepfold must preach Christ's glory, not their own. Erasmus' phrasing here is also reminiscent of another passage of Augustine, on a later part of this chapter: in discussing (*Tract in Joannem* 46.5) the clergy who like Christ are pastors, he says, 'If they are pastors, how is there one pastor, except that they are all members of the one pastor, whose own sheep they are?' *Pastor,* the Latin word for 'shepherd,' was borrowed early in Christian tradition as the term for a holder of sacerdotal office.

8 Cf Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 45.6: 'He is a thief because he calls his own what belongs to another; a robber because he kills what he has stolen.'

9 Nicholas of Lyra (on 10:4) 215v–216r says 'For the shepherds in that land have this practice, that they go before the flock whistling with voice and pipe, and the sheep are guided by the sound.'

10 'Jews': in the editions of 1523, 1524, and 1534 this word was 'Pharisees'; the 1535 edition changed it to 'Jews.'

11 The swine are introduced probably from the parable of the Gadarene swine, Matt 8:30–2, Mark 5:11–14, Luke 8:32–3; the goats from Matt 25:31–3.

12 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 59.2 says the doorkeeper is Moses; Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 46.2–4 says it is Jesus himself or the Holy Spirit; Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 10:1–5) proposes Moses or the Holy Spirit; neither they nor the medieval Latin commentators suggest it is the Father.

13 For the pastures as being those of everlasting life cf Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 47.1. But for a different interpretation of 'pastures' cf the paraphrase on 10:9 and nn20 and 21 below.

131

14 *Parabola* 'parable' paraphrases *proverbium* 'proverb' of the Vulgate text. Erasmus remarks in the annotation on 10:6 (*hoc proverbium*) that the Greek text 'seems to have used παροιμίαν "proverb" in place of "parable" because many proverbs have an admixture of metaphor.' Cf n4 above, and notice that Erasmus mentions 'metaphor' later in this sentence.

15 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 59.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 10:6–8) give a similar explanation for Jesus' use of the metaphor of the shepherd and the sheep.

16 In the paraphrase on this chapter Erasmus presents Jesus' criticism of the Pharisees, scribes, and priests, together with his description of the good shepherd, in a way that strongly implies applicability to the clergy of his own day. In this he follows a well-established tradition in the exposition of chapter 10. Though such a mode of interpretation is only just present in Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 59 and 60, it is clearly asserted and developed in Augustine, eg *Tract in Joannem* 45.5, 46.5–6, 47.2–3, and after that in the *Gloss* (eg on 10:2, 8, 12, 13) 215v–216v and Nicholas of Lyra (eg on 10:1, 16) 215v–216v. Hugh of St Cher (on 10:2) 348v and following says, relying on Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 59.2–3: 'In comparing himself to a good shepherd [*pastor*] Christ gives to all pastors an outline of their duties. And he touches on six points in which the ideal of a pastor consists ...' Hugh (on 10:4) 349v also discusses at length the proper and improper behaviour of priests; he speaks (on 10:1) 348v of the entry into the fold as meaning entry on the duties of a pastor and says that that is the meaning in this chapter. See the next note.

17 That the sheepfold or enclosure stands in the metaphor for the church is the view of Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 45.5, who exhorts his congregation, 'Hold fast to this, that the sheepfold of Christ is the Catholic church'; cf also 45.15. The identification is repeated by the interlinear *Gloss* (on 10:1) 215v and the marginal *Gloss* (on 10:9) 216r.

18 The paraphrase omits 'before me,' which Erasmus read in his Greek text but was not in the Vulgate; he says in the annotation on 10:8 (*quotquot venerunt*) that the phrase could be merely an explanatory addition by a reader. Its standing in modern texts is not above question; cf Nestle-Aland 26th ed on the verse.

19 Cf n11 above.

20 Cf n13 above; the identification of the sheep's feed as 'fodder of the gospel' may owe something to Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 45.15, who has spiritual nourishment as one explanation of the pastures, and to Hugh of St Cher (on 10:9) 350r, where he says that the sheep will find pasture 'by study and reading or by hearing sermons.'

21 The assignment of contemplation as the object of going in and good works as the object of going out follows Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 45.15: 'Going in is when we consider something inwardly; going out is when we do some work outwardly.' In the same section, however, Augustine returns to the view of the pastures as spiritual nourishment; see previous note.

22 Cf Mark 13:21–2.

132

23 Cf Rom 5:6–7, 1 John 3:16, and in this Gospel 15:13.

133

24 Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 46.5–6 has a long discussion on the utility and necessity of the hireling shepherd (or insufficiently committed Christian cleric), who preaches the gospel for the flock as long as he himself is not discommoded.

25 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 59.3 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 10:10–13) point out that the wolf in verse 12 stands for the spiritual enemy.

26 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 60.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 10:14–16) explain that the gentiles are meant, referring to such passages as 1 Cor 7:19 and Eph 2:11–16.

134

27 Cf 3:16.

28 The emphasis here and in what follows, on Jesus' exercise of free will in choosing to die, is paralleled in Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 60.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 10:17–21), both of whom also mention, as Erasmus does below, the ordinary human occurrences of unwanted death and suicide.

135

29 For the emphatic pairing of deeds and words at this point, cf Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 60.3 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 10:17–21); see also the paraphrase on 9:1 and n1.

30 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 60.3 similarly makes explicit what he calls the syllogism implied in verse 21: the words are not human, so are they demonic? The deeds are not demonic but divine, so the words, not being human, must also be not demonic but divine. For the divinity revealed in causing the blind to see and the lame to walk, cf eg Isa 35:5–6.

31 Erasmus has written the sentence from 'sometimes we must yield' as direct speech, not as further clauses after 'teaching us that ...'

32 Encaenia: the Latinized Greek name for the feast of the Dedication. The explanation of the festival given here is also found in Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 61.1. Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 10:22–6) repeats Chrysostom and also says that some think it may be the dedication of Solomon's temple. Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 48.2 says only that the term means the dedication of a temple. Erasmus gives the same explanation as here in the annotation on 10:22 (*facta sunt encaenia*).

33 A similar play on metaphors of cold and heat, inspired by the mention of winter in 10:22, is in Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 48.3: 'And the Pharisees were cold, for they were slow to approach that divine fire ... they were frozen out, far from the charity of loving, and they burned with desire to harm.'

34 According to Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 10:22–6) Jesus himself is Solomon, and the name Solomon means 'peacemaker,' the definition also given by Jerome *De nominibus hebraicis* CCL 72 138.

35 Cf the paraphrase on 1:35.

36 The Jews' intentions here are interpreted as malicious by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 61.1 and Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 48.3.

37 For a similar emphasis on words and deeds, cf Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 61.1, who also had commented on the mildness of Jesus' reply. Cf also 10:37–8 and the paraphrase on those verses.

136

38 The paraphrase on verse 24 from 'if I do make the proclamation' through 'I have already said' accommodates both the present tense 'I speak and you do not believe' that Erasmus found in the Vulgate version, and the past tense 'I spoke and you do not believe' that he found in his Greek texts; cf the annotation on 10:25 (*loquor vobis*).

39 This sentence, actually the paraphrase on verse 27, is inserted into the paraphrase on verse 26.

40 'Goads': *aculeos* in all the editions printed in Erasmus' lifetime, a word in use in both classical and Christian Latin. LB VII 585D prints *equuleos*, a classical word, but in much less common use; a diminutive of *equus* 'horse,' it was also applied to a horse-shaped instrument of torture.

41 The paraphrase follows the Vulgate reading of 10:28, 'that which the Father gave me is greater than all'; however, as Erasmus remarked in the annotation on 10:28 (*pater quod dedit mihi*), the Greek text here reads 'my Father who gave it to me is greater than all.' Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 61.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 10:27–30) have the reading of the Greek text, but Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 48.6 interprets the Vulgate text.

137

42 'Again' was not in Erasmus' Vulgate text of verse 31, but in the Greek, as he says in the annotation on 10:31 (*sustulerunt ergo lapides*).

43 'Sons of God' alludes not only to the quotation from the psalm in Jesus' reply below but also to the earlier claim by the Pharisees that God is their father, 8:41.

44 Cf Deut 6:4, and also the preface to this *Paraphrase* in chapter 1, 14, on the difficulties the Jews have in accepting the trinitarian concept of God.

138

45 This sentence is the paraphrase on 10:35–6, a passage difficult to punctuate and interpret. It reads '[35] If he called those gods to whom the word of God was spoken and Scripture cannot be undone [36] to the one whom the Father sanctified and sent into the world you say "You blaspheme" because I said, "I am the Son of God."' Erasmus had two proposals in the annotation on 10:35 (*et non potest solvi scriptura*), but the paraphrase follows neither of these. Instead it adjusts the passage to a punctuation that divides the whole according to the modern division between verses 35 and 36, understanding both clauses of verse 35 as conditions, 'if he called them' and 'if Scripture cannot be undone,' and verse 36 as a question. The treatment of the passage in the 1527 *Annotations* was much enlarged along the same lines as in the paraphrase here.

46 Cf 1:1 and the paraphrase on 6:35, 51, 63. Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 48.9, also alluding to 1:1 in his discussion of 10:34–7, says, 'If the word of God was spoken to humans that they might be called gods, how is the very word of God which is with God not God?' Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 10:31–6) dwells here on Jesus as the word of God.

47 The whole clause from 'to finish what they had now tried to do' represents the 'again' that Erasmus says in the annotation on 10:39 (*quaerebant eum apprehendere*) is in his Greek text of the verse but not in the Latin.

48 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 61.3 points out that Jesus has yielded to the anger of his opponents, commenting that it is his regular practice when he had made particularly disturbing statements. Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 10:39–42) calls the Pharisees' state of mind madness.

49 The name 'Shechem' here is evidently Erasmus' mistake. The change of location for the Baptist's activities is given at 3:23, but the new site is identified there as Aenon near Salim; cf the paraphrase on 3:23.

50 The importance of escaping the corrupting influence of cities is stressed here also by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 61.3 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 10:39–42). Cf the paraphrase on 8:2 and n3.

139

51 The same point is made by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 61.3 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 10:39–42).

52 Cf 1:27.

53 'The situation itself makes clear': *res ipsa declarat,* a variation on *res ipsa loquitur;* cf the paraphrase on 3:2 n5.

Chapter 11

1 Nowhere in this chapter or the next does Erasmus explicitly identify Mary the sister of Martha with the unnamed notorious sinner of Luke 7:36–50, or with the unnamed woman of Matt 26:6–13 and Mark 14:3–9. Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 62.1, followed by Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 11:1–3), specifically says that this Mary and the women in Luke and Matthew are not the same person; however, the more general tradition is that they are the same, as Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 49.3 says. Hugh of St Cher (on 11:2) 354r and v and Nicholas of Lyra (on 11:2) 218r both report the minority and majority opinions. In the present sentence Erasmus conflates details from the synoptics and John 12 to describe Mary's action. See also the paraphrase on 12:3 and n6.

2 The phraseology here is that of Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 49.5, who says 'For the news only had to be reported to one who loved him,' and the *Gloss* (on 11:3) 218r, saying 'It is enough to report the news to a lover, who does not abandon the one he loves'; similarly also Nicholas of Lyra (on 11:3) 218r.

140

3 'Through its occurrence': *per eius occasionem,* a phrase carefully written to correct the contemporary Vulgate reading *per eum* 'through him,' ie Lazarus. Erasmus says in the annotation on 11:4 (*ut glorificetur filius Dei per eum*) that the *eum,* a masculine pronoun, is a mistranslation of the Greek pronoun that clearly refers to 'illness,' which is feminine in both Greek and Latin.

4 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 62.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 11:4–6) point out that Lazarus' illness was not caused by God to further any divine purpose but that God's glory is a result of the circumstance of the illness, a view that Erasmus' treatment reflects. Cf the paraphrase on 9:3 n6.

Neither Chrysostom nor Theophylact, however, has anything that corresponds to Erasmus' alternative explanation, that misfortunes happen for the good of the afflicted.

5 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 62.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 11:4–6) also point out here that Jesus wanted the evidence of Lazarus' death to be indisputable before he worked the miracle. Cf the paraphrase on 11:15 below.

6 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 62.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 11:7–10) say that the disciples' fear is both for themselves and for Jesus, but Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 49.8 and Hugh of St Cher (on 11:8) 355r claim that their fear is entirely for themselves. For the Pharisees' earlier attempts on Jesus, cf eg 7:1, 30, 32–44; 8:59; 10:31–9; and the paraphrases on those passages.

7 Cf 1:5 and 9, 8:12, 12:46. The allusion is also suggested here by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 62.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 11:7–10), and pointed out specifically by Hugh of St Cher (on 11:9) 355r.

141

8 Erasmus' combination of paraphrase and explication of what he described just above as a riddle follows his own comment in the annotation on 11:9 (*nonne duodecim horae sunt diei*). He says there that the explanations of both Augustine (*Tract in Joannem* 49.8) and Chrysostom (*Hom in Joannem* 62.1, followed by Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* [on 11:7–10]) seem to him rather forced: Augustine held that Christ is the day and the apostles the twelve hours, while Chrysostom offered a pair of alternatives, either that the innocent have nothing to fear or that those who cling to Christ the light of the world have nothing to fear. Erasmus finds it simpler to understand a less metaphorical meaning, that there is nothing to fear because the time of the crucifixion has not yet come and cannot be hurried. He cites in support Luke 13:32.

9 That Jesus' words have not removed the disciples' fear is also noted by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 62.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 11:11–16).

10 'For sleep in sick people is usually a sign of returning health': *nam in aegrotis somnus esse solet rediturae sanitatis argumentum*, almost a quotation of Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 49.11: *solet enim esse somnus aegrotantium salutis indicium* 'for the sleep of the sick is usually a mark of health.' Augustine is also quoted here by Hugh of St Cher (on 11:12) 355r.

11 The use of sleep as a metaphor for death is common in scriptural language. Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 49.9 cites 1 Thess 4:13: 'We do not want you, brothers, to be in ignorance about those who sleep'; Hugh of St Cher (on 11:11) 355r cites the same passage and also Matt 9:24: 'The child is not dead, she is asleep.' Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 11:11–16) gives as one reason for Jesus' use of the metaphor here the fact that to him it is only a sleep from which he will rouse Lazarus, though Theophylact and Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 62.2 agree that Jesus says nothing about raising Lazarus in order to avoid any appearance of boastfulness. Erasmus presents the latter idea at the end of the paragraph.

12 That it is as easy or easier for Jesus to rouse the dead as for us to wake a sleeper is noted by Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 49.9 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 11:11–16).

13 The paraphrase of Jesus' speech in verse 15 follows the line implied in the paraphrase on verse 4 and in the commentators' observations on that verse; cf n4 above. Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 62.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 11:11–16) propose two possible reasons for Jesus' saying in verse 15 that he is glad: either because he had the opportunity to prophesy the death and demonstrate his divine omniscience or because he was not present at the death and so his disciples' faith will be more perfect when he subverts its effect.

14 The 'reason' appears not to be what Jesus has just said, since the disciples have not been told what he intends to do, but, as Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 62.2 says, the demands of friendship. Cf the paraphrase on verse 19 below.

142

15 That Didymus in Greek means *geminus* 'the twin' in Latin is also explained by the interlinear *Gloss* (on 11:16) 218v.

16 That Thomas is weaker than the rest of the disciples and speaks in desperation born of fear is the view of Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 62.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 11:16). The *Gloss* (on 11:16) 218v, however, regards the speech as a sign of Thomas' greater love and willingness to follow Jesus even to death. Hugh of St Cher (on 11:16) 355v cites both views but prefers Chrysostom's; Nicholas of Lyra (on 11:16) 218v offers either interpretation but seems to favour that of the *Gloss*.

17 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 62.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 11:17–20) also note that the proximity of Bethany to Jerusalem meant a greater number of visitors to the bereaved sisters and thus more witnesses to the miracle.

18 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 62.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 11:17–20) remark that the reason for so many visitors, beyond mere proximity, is the duty owed to families of high station, a reason repeated by Hugh of St Cher (on 11:19) 355v and Nicholas of Lyra (on 11:19) 219r.

19 This characterization of Martha is borrowed from Luke 10:40–2, a passage quoted in part here by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 62.2.

20 The inadequacy of Martha's faith at this point is noted by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 62.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 11:21–8).

21 Cf Acts 23:6–8 and the paraphrase on 1:24 above.

22 Jesus' two purposes as described by Erasmus here, to raise Martha's faith and esteem to a higher level and to declare his own divine power over life and death, are also noted by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 62.3 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 11:21–8). The imbalance in the clauses, with 'who by his prayers not only could ...' set against 'but that he himself was ...,' is Erasmus' own.

143

23 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 62.3 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 11:21–8) both comment here on the life and death of the body as expressing and intimately related to the life or death of the soul; Augustine's opening remarks on the whole episode had been to the effect that the life or death of

the soul is much more important a matter than the life or death of the body, *Tract in Joannem* 49.2.

24 The relative inconsequence of Martha's reply to the question she was asked is noted by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 62.3 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 11:21–8).

25 The Vulgate word is *credidi* 'I have believed' but Erasmus says *credo* 'I believe,' following his own annotation on 11:27 (*ego credidi quia tu es*), where he had noted that Greek idiom uses a perfect tense for verbs denoting emotion, while the natural Latin expression would be present tense.

26 As Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 49.16 notes, the Evangelist does not in fact say that Martha was told to do this, but for brevity's sake left it to be inferred from what Martha actually did. The explanation is repeated by Hugh of St Cher (on 11:28) 356v and Nicholas of Lyra (on 11:28) 219r; Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 11:21–8) has a convoluted version.

27 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 63.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 11:29–32) also say that since the crowd of mourners did not know that Mary was going to meet one they thought of as an enemy, Jesus had the advantage of a larger number of witnesses to the miracle.

28 Erasmus' expression 'the walls of the town' is designed to clarify and correct the Vulgate text of verse 30, which says that Jesus had not yet entered the *castellum*, a word that means a small fortification. The term apparently lent itself to misunderstanding, for in the annotation on 11:29 (*et venit*) he says '*castellum* here means a small town or hamlet, lest anyone imagine it means a palace or tyrant's citadel.' The paraphrase, by mentioning town walls, implies an easy explanation of how a town might be called a *castellum*.

29 What Erasmus calls an ancient custom is not a Jewish but a well-known Roman custom; it may have impressed itself on his mind if he saw the tomb-lined Via Appia on his visit to Rome in 1509.

144

30 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 63.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 11:29–32) comment that Jesus did not deal with Mary as he had with Martha because of the sisters' different emotional states and the different circumstances under which he spoke to each one.

31 That Jesus' expression of emotion here is evidence of his genuinely human nature is noted by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 63.1 and 2, and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 11:33–7). Nicholas of Lyra (on 11:35) 219v says that Jesus shows his human nature especially when using his divine might lest we not believe in his humanity.

32 Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 49.18 says that all Jesus' experience of human emotions is the result of an act of his own will, unlike our experience of them.

33 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 63.1 says that the reason for Jesus' emotion is to stir the crowd; Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 49.19 says that Jesus wants to show us how to mourn our sins; Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 11:33–7) thinks that the expression of emotion followed by its curbing is Jesus' point. Erasmus' explanation is none of these but closest to that of Nicholas of Lyra (on 11:33) 219r: 'Groaning arises from indignation. For that groaning of Christ's proceeded from his indignation at the devil, at whose suggestion death came into the world, and whom he was soon to defeat.'

34 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 63.1 marks a deliberate curbing of emotion before Jesus' question (there is none mentioned in the Gospel text), and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 11:33–7) assigns it the same didactic function as Erasmus does. Continuing his remarks quoted in the previous note, Nicholas of Lyra goes on to add that Jesus' emotions were the result of no flaw of nature but arose from his reason, citing Aristotle *Nicomachean Ethics* 4, apparently meaning the discussion of appropriate anger at the beginning of book 4. Aristotle says, for instance (4.5.3; 1125b30), 'The even-tempered man will be imperturbable and not led by emotion, but when reason directs, in the right way and in the right circumstances and for the right length of time, he will be angry.'

35 The same motive for the question is given by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 63.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 11:33–7).

36 For the display of emotion as proof of Jesus' humanity, cf n31 above. The treatment of Jesus' weeping as a model for the lamentation owed to the death of the soul owes much to Augustine's treatment of the Lazarus story as a type of the death of the soul, *Tract in Joannem* 49.2 and 22–4; cf the paraphrase on 11:25–6 and n23 above.

145

37 Cf 9:32.

38 Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 49.19 regards Jesus' behaviour in his outbursts of emotion as models for our behaviour when we mourn our sins and backsliding.

39 The same explanation is in Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 63.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 11:38–42).

40 The text of 11:39 does not identify the hearers; apparently the deduction that relatives are the ones asked to move the stone is Erasmus' own. Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 63.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 11:38–42) speak only of the bystanders, though the reason given by Chrysostom and Theophylact for Jesus' not moving the stone by his divine might is the same as Erasmus'. Chrysostom does speak of 'friends' being asked to remove the bandages in 11:44, where the Gospel text says only 'them.'

41 The same contrast between resurrection of one rotting body that still preserves the form of its parts and the general resurrection when ashes will be remade into flesh is made by Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 49.1, at the beginning of his treatment of this episode.

42 'He stinks': *foetet*, the same word that is found in the Vulgate text, though Erasmus had said in the annotation on 11:39 (*iam fetet*) that *olet* 'he reeks' would be a less vulgar translation of the Greek.

43 The gentleness of Jesus' rebuke of Martha is also noted by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 63.2.

44 The first of the two lessons to be taught echoes Erasmus' own words earlier in the paraphrase on 6:11; the second one is also given by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 64.1–2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 11:38–42).

146

45 The typological interpretation again is closely related to that of Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 49.22–4; cf nn23, 36, 38, and 41 above.

46 That this is the reason for Lazarus to come out still in his grave-clothes is

noted by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 63.2 and Nicholas of Lyra (on 11:44) 219v.

47 Presumably Erasmus means such accounts as 1 Kings 17:17–24, Elijah's revival of the son of the widow of Zarephath.

48 The enhancement of the miracle by Lazarus' coming out bound as he was (not the same idea as his being dressed in his grave-clothes; cf n46) is also noted by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 64.3, Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 11:43–6) and Nicholas of Lyra (on 11:44) 219v.

49 'To his friends' is a detail from Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 63.2; cf n40 above.

50 Erasmus summarizes here the evidence for the miracle of Lazarus' resurrection from death; cf nn5, 13, 27, 35, 46, and 49 above.

51 That Jesus refrained from boasting after this miracle is also noted by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 64.3.

147

52 A similar contrast between what the Pharisees ought to have done and what they did do is in Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 64.3.

53 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 64.3 also says that the Pharisees are construing Jesus' actions as a threat to public safety in an attempt to conceal their personal motives.

54 'The source of all salvation, on the pretext of public safety': *praetextu publicae salutis ... omnis salutis auctor.* Erasmus puns on two possible meanings of *salus* 'safety' and 'salvation.' He had done so also in the paraphrase on chapter 5; cf n8 in that chapter.

55 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 65.1 says that the priesthood was both annual and procured by purchase, information repeated by Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 11:49–53) and Nicholas of Lyra (on 11:49) 220r. Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 49.27 says only that the priesthood was annual.

148

56 The particulars in this list of indicators of the universality of the church may be assigned to a variety of sources. Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 65.1, followed by Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 11:49–53), mentions here Rome and India as two extremes of the universal church; India and Ethiopia are named as the extremes of Ahasuerus' empire in Esther 1:1 and 8:9. There is also a famous Ethiopian who becomes a convert of Philip's, Acts 8:27–40. Greeks are frequently mentioned in the Pauline Epistles as having access to the faith, eg 1 Cor 1:22–4. The description of the universal unity of the church at Col 3:11, besides mentioning Greeks, also includes Scythians. Scythians and Britons are almost proverbial examples in classical Roman writers of the extremes of the world, rather beyond civilized existence, eg Virgil *Eclogues* 1.65–6: 'Some [outcasts] will go to Scythia ... and to the Britons far separated from the whole world.' Horace invokes Fortuna, whom all the world, including the Scythians, reveres, to preserve the emperor, who is to go to the Britons, remotest peoples of the world (*Odes* 1.35). Erasmus himself had often visited Britain to his pleasure and profit. Cf the mention of Scythians and Britons in the *Paraphrase on Romans* CWE 42 17 (and n13).

57 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 65.2 also contrasts here the piety of the approaching festival with the plans for murder.

58 'Not wanting to add fuel to the fire': *ne furorem adderet furori;* cf the paraphrase on John 7 n25.

59 Echoing Matt 23:37 and Luke 13:34

60 The same explanation of Jesus' action here as a type of the spread of the church among the gentiles is implied by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 65.1 and explicitly stated by Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 11:54–6). It is Theophylact who suggests a connection between the name of the town and the typological significance, for he says it means καρποφορία 'yield (from a crop).' Erasmus gives, however, the definition of Jerome *De nominibus hebraicis* CCL 72 65 and 81 (under Genesis and Numbers, not the slightly different definition under John, CCL 72 142): *Efraim frugifer sive crescens* 'Ephraim: fruitful or growing.' Erasmus' last clause, 'for Ephraim in Hebrew means "growing,"' was added in the 1534 edition.

61 'Phase' is the Latinized spelling of an alternative Greek spelling of the Hebrew word for Passover, more usually in its Greco-Latin form Pascha. The alternative form is found in various places in the Septuagint. Jerome lists *fase* in *De nominibus hebraicis* CCL 72 140 and 157, where he explains it as meaning *pascha* (which he also lists). Why Erasmus should choose it here is unclear, since his own Greek and Latin texts of the Gospel verse print πάσχα and *pascha*. Cf the *Paraphrase on Mark* CWE 49 156 and n1.

62 Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 50.2 also uses the Gospel's reference to the Passover here as the opportunity to give this explanation of the origin of the festival.

149

63 The same contrast between the scrupulous keeping of the holy day and the intention to commit murder is pointed out by Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 50.2.

Chapter 12

1 Conceptually the allusion is to Isa 53:7, but Erasmus' expression for 'for the slaughter,' *ad victimam,* is not used there. It does appear in the Vulgate Jer 11:19, 12:3, 51:40, though not in a context that could refer to the Lamb of God. However, the interlinear *Gloss* (on 12:1) 221r says *venit quasi agnus ad victimam* 'he came like a lamb to the slaughter.' Hugh of St Cher (on 12:1) 358v gives the same quotation as being from Augustine, though it is not found in the relevant part of *Tract in Joannem,* and also gives a false scriptural reference, to Jer 4.

2 Erasmus' usual sources all preserve the six days of the Gospel text; the *Gloss* (on 12:1) 221r even makes a correlation with the six days of creation and other six-day periods in Scripture. Erasmus seems to have adjusted the numbering system, not the actual number of days, to the Roman way of calculating dates, in which the count goes backwards from a fixed day but includes that day in the series; thus the Romans said that Augustus was born nine days before 1 October, ie 23 September.

3 Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 12:1–3) describes a Jewish custom of having a festive meal six days before the celebration of the Passover, to mark the

beginning of the festival season. The editions of the *Paraphrase on John* published in Erasmus' lifetime have a marginal note beside this passage: 'See Theophylact'; such a note referring to a source is not usual in the *Paraphrases.*

4 Erasmus has given no indication of where 'there' might be, but he implies, against Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 65.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 12:1–3), that this dinner is not being given at the home of Mary, Martha, and Lazarus. The alternative tradition is that the occasion was the same as that at the house of Simon the leper reported in the synoptics (Matt 26:6–13, Mark 14:3–9, Luke 7:36–50); it is so understood by Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 49.3, Hugh of St Cher (on 12:2) 358v, and Nicholas of Lyra (on 12:2) 221r. See also the paraphrase on chapter 11 n1.

5 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 65.2 says that Lazarus proves his resuscitation by living and eating; Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 50.5 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 12:1–3) add his conversation as further evidence, followed by the *Gloss* (on 12:2) 221r and Nicholas of Lyra (on 11:44) 219v.

6 Added from the accounts in Matt 26:6–13 and Mark 14:3–9, in accordance with the tradition identifying the present episode with those accounts. The *Gloss* (on 12:1) and Nicholas of Lyra (on 12:3) 221r and Hugh of St Cher (on 12:3) 359r all agree that though the Evangelist does not say so Jesus' head was anointed here too.

7 In the editions of 1523 and 1524 Erasmus omitted the anointing of Jesus' feet (which is in the Gospel text) and included only the bathing with tears (added from Luke 7:38): 'She bathed his feet with her tears and dried them with her hair.' The words 'anointed with the perfume and' were added in the 1534 edition.

150

8 Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 12:4–8) reports that 'some say' that Judas carried the purse because he was less than the others and this is a lesser office; he cites Acts 6:2 in support.

9 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 65.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 12:4–8) point out that another evangelist (Matt 26:8; cf Mark 14:4) says all the disciples criticized the wastefulness of Mary's action, but that their reasons and Judas' reasons for doing so were quite different.

10 'Lust for money': *pecuniae cupiditas,* a more exact translation than the Vulgate's *cupiditas* of the *φιλαργυρία* mentioned as the root of all evil in 1 Tim 6:10, a passage quoted here by Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 12:4–8). In his 1519 Latin revision of the Vulgate, Erasmus had translated the Greek word as *studium pecuniae* 'zeal for money.'

11 That Jesus does not betray Judas or rebuke him directly is also noted by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 65.2, Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 50.10–11, and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 12:4–8).

12 Erasmus' plural verb form for 'do not grumble' indicates that this instruction is given to all the disciples, not just to Judas. The contemporary Vulgate text also had a plural form here in verse 7, *sinite* 'allow her.' In the annotation on 12:7 (*sinite illam*) Erasmus observes that the Greek verb 'let her be' is singular, as is the verb in some old Latin texts, and thus addressed only to Judas. The paraphrase, however, includes all the disciples in the grumbling, influenced by the synoptic accounts. See n9 above.

13 The contemporary Vulgate read here 'Allow her to keep it for the day of my burial.' Though this reading has support in the Greek textual tradition (cf Nestle-Aland 26th ed on the passage), in the annotation on 12:7 (*ut in diem sepulturae meae servet illud*) Erasmus reports that the Greek texts available to him, as well as Chrysostom (*Hom in Joannem* 65.2), read 'Let her be; she has kept it [or 'done it,' Chrysostom] for the day of my burial,' for, he explains, Mary was anticipating Christ's burial.

151

14 The social standing of Mary, Martha, and Lazarus was considered to be high; cf the paraphrase on chapter 11 n18.

15 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 66.1 discusses the Pharisees' resentment of Lazarus because of the favour he had won for Jesus from the Jews. He notes their plans to kill Lazarus even without legitimate grounds and compares their plans for him with their treatment of the blind man in chapter 9. Cf also Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 12:9–11).

16 For this description of the nature of the palm tree, with the classical sources, cf *Adagia* I iii 4: *Palmam ferre* 'to bear the palm.' Erasmus used the palm tree as an example twice in *Parabolae* CWE 23 241 and 263. Cf also Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 12:14–16).

17 Ps 118:26; but Erasmus' paraphrase adds *nobis expectatus* 'whom we have long expected' and omits 'king of Israel,' which is part of the quotation as given in 12:13 but is not part of the parallel quotation at Matt 23:39.

18 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 66.1 also notes that Jesus' action in riding on the donkey is partly a lesson in humility and partly fulfilment of prophecies.

19 Actually a variant not only of Isa 40:9 but also of Zech 9:9, as Erasmus knew when he wrote the annotation on 12:15 (*ecce rex tuus*). The addition of 'gentle' is from Zechariah and the version of the same quotation found in Matt 21:5.

20 The expectation of a political leader is also noted by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 66.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 12:12, 13).

152

21 'Since the creation of the world': *ab orbe condito;* cf the paraphrase on chapter 9 n38.

22 In using a first-person verb here ('we make no headway') as the Vulgate text also does, Erasmus maintains a characterization of the Pharisees as completely hostile. But his own Greek text, as also Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 66.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 12:17–19), read the second person 'you make no headway'; Chrysostom and Theophylact supposed the speakers to be the Pharisees who secretly favoured Jesus. Erasmus takes no notice of this passage in his annotations.

23 In the annotation on 12:19 (*ecce mundus totus abit post eum*) Erasmus points out that 'whole' is not in the Greek and was not read by Chrysostom (*Hom in Joannem* 66.2) or by Augustine (*Tract in Joannem* 51); the paraphrase, however, stays with the Vulgate text and says 'whole world.'

24 Andrew's priority in rank is mentioned as the reason why Philip goes to him instead of directly to Jesus by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 66.2, Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 12:20–5), and Nicholas of Lyra (on 12:22) 222r.

153

25 Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 51.8 also combines here the triumphant reception of Jesus by the Jews and the desire of the gentiles to meet him, and sees in the combination a sign of the universality of the post-resurrection church.

26 The same explanation, that Jesus' fame will be spread by his death, is given here by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 66.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 12:20–5).

27 Cf Phil 1:21.

28 Erasmus' paraphrase *hanc vitam in hoc mundo* 'life here in this world' of the Vulgate text's *animam* '(one's own) life,' 'soul,' 'breath of life' emphatically follows Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 51.10 in identifying 'life' as 'earthly life'; Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 67.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 12:25, 26) understand it to mean the ungoverned passions of the soul.

29 Too commonplace to be an adage but very like one of the index headings prepared by Erasmus himself for the *Adagia*: *Vita hominis misera et brevis* 'Human life is unhappy and short' LB II *Index proverbiorum juxta locos* 57.

30 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 67.1 alludes here to the disciples' deaths.

154

31 Commenting on the use of the verb *turbari* in 12:27 ('troubled' in Erasmus' previous sentence), Nicholas of Lyra (on 12:27) 222v remarks that 'something is called "troubled" when it is stirred up; hence a stirred-up sea is called "troubled."' Similarly Erasmus uses a meteorological expansion of the same thought. Cf the paraphrase on 6:16–21.

32 In expanding the single question in the Gospel text of 12:27, 'What am I to say?' to this series of questions, Erasmus uses one form of a rhetorical figure known as *dubitatio* or hesitation, when the speaker poses to himself alternative courses of action. Quintilian *Institutio Oratoria* 9.2.12 gives as an example the opening speech in Terence *Eunuchus* 46–9: 'So what am I to do? Am I not to go ...? Or am I to prepare myself not to endure ...? ... Shall I go back?' Macrobius *Saturnalia* 4.6.11 says, 'According to the orators pathos is also created by hesitation, which the Greeks call *aporesis*; for to hesitate over what one should do is typical of someone in anger or grief,' and then quotes the soliloquy in which the deserted Dido considers various unfeasible courses of action, Virgil *Aeneid* 4.534–52: 'What am I doing? Shall I try my earlier suitors? ... Shall I follow the Trojan fleet? ... Shall I alone accompany them ... or go with all my people ...?'

33 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 67.1–2, Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 52.1–3, and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 12:25, 26) all discuss at some length the revelation in this episode of the weakness of Jesus' human nature, utterly subject to the human fear of death. Cf also Matt 26:38.

155

34 Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 52.4 suggests Jesus' human life and miracles as one explanation of the reference to the glory he has already received, and says that the future glory will be in his resurrection and heavenly reign. Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 12:27–8) has the same explanation of the prior glory and lists the cross, the resurrection, and the sending of the Holy Spirit as marks of the future glory.

35 Erasmus adds to his Latin 'prince' the Latinized Greek word (familiar to the Romans) 'tyrant,' used here by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 67.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 12:29–33). Cf his expatiation on the nature of the tyrant in *Institutio principis christiani* CWE 27 223–31.

36 Erasmus emphasizes the courtroom language of 12:31, as Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 67.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 12:29–33) had also done. Theophylact points out here the metaphorical nature of such language.

37 By speaking of 'the sin of all' here (in a sentence not paralleled by anything in 12:32) as well as 'I shall ... draw all things everywhere' in the next sentence (which does paraphrase 12:32), Erasmus seems to be offering a paraphrase that accommodates the divergent Greek and Latin traditions he found for the text of 12:32. In his annotation on this verse (*omnia traham*) he says that the Greek text, confirmed by Chrysostom (*Hom in Joannem* 67.3, and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem*, on 12:29–33), says 'I shall draw all people' (πάντας), not 'all things' (πάντα); yet the Vulgate reading is *omnia* 'all things,' confirmed by Augustine (*Tract in Joannem* 52.11), who lays much stress on the importance of this reading. Erasmus himself comments in the annotation that there is not much difference in meaning.

38 For the Gospel text's *si exaltatus fuero* 'if I am lifted' Erasmus writes *quum exaltatus fuero* 'when I am lifted.' Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 52.11 had said that the *si* here means *quum* and that we are not to think Jesus was in any doubt about the event.

39 Cf 3:14, with the details added in the paraphrase on that verse.

40 That some of the crowd made this deduction is noted by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 68.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 12:34–6).

156

41 This and the two preceding prophecies are quoted here by Hugh of St Cher (on 12:34) 363r.

42 In this sentence Erasmus elaborates the text of 12:34 in the form of a syllogism, a method of argument taught for its rhetorical applications quite as much as for its use in formal logic; cf Cicero *De inventione* 1.57–77, Quintilian *Institutio Oratoria* 5.14.1–26.

43 *Lumen inter vos versatur*. As he had also remarked in the annotation on 12:35 (*adhuc modicum lumen*), Erasmus here prefers the interpretation of Chrysostom (*Hom in Joannem* 68.1), who understands the 'light' to be Jesus himself, over that of Augustine (*Tract in Joannem* 52.13), who takes the 'light' as the hearers' understanding of the law that they mention in 12:34. Erasmus also points out in the annotation that the Greek μεθ' ὑμῶν 'with you' should be translated by a Latin expression for 'with you,' not by the Vulgate's *in vobis* 'in (or 'within') you.' So here he paraphrases *inter vos* 'among you.'

44 Cf eg 8:12 and 9:5.

45 Cf 9:39 and the paraphrase on 9:39–41.

46 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 68.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 12:36–40) also say that Jesus leaves to calm the hostility of the Pharisees.

157

47 Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 53.6 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 12:36–40) here stress the wilfulness of the Pharisees' unbelief.

48 For the preferred seating in the synagogue cf Luke 20:46. For banning from the synagogue as meritorious in God's eyes, cf 9:34 and the paraphrase on the passage; Nicholas of Lyra (on 12:43) 223v makes a similar comment and refers to chapter 9.

158

49 The paragraph to this point has paraphrased 12:44; this sentence begins the paraphrase on 12:46. There is no paraphrase on 12:45.

50 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 69.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 12:46, 47) both point out here that Paul (as they say) in Heb 1:3 calls the Son ἀπαύγασμα 'beam of light,' 'radiation,' 'effulgence.'

Chapter 13

159

1 Erasmus has already identified both Pascha (at the paraphrase on 2:13; cf n30) and Phase (at the paraphrase on 11:55; cf n61) as Hebrew words. The word in the Gospel text of 13:1 is Pascha; in explaining it both the *Gloss* (on 13:1) 224r and Hugh of St Cher (on 13:1) 364v introduce Phase as the Hebrew term for Passover, though Hugh at least knows that Pascha is also Hebrew. Cf Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 55.1. All these commentators draw attention to the fact that the Evangelist makes a punning allusion to the meaning of the word when he says that Jesus knew the time had come for him to pass over (*μεταβῇ, transeat*). The same observation is in Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 70.1, Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 13:1), and Nicholas of Lyra (on 13:1) 224v. Likewise Erasmus: 'answering to the name of the festival.'

2 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 70.1, Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 13:1), and Nicholas of Lyra (on 13:1) 224v say that Jesus' purpose here is to strengthen the disciples against the evils they will face after his departure. Cf also the paraphrase on 13:31 below.

3 'Unending love': *perpetuam charitatem.* This interpretation of 'to the end' in the Gospel text is one of those proposed by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 70.1. Contrast the paraphrase on 13:34 and n39.

160

4 Erasmus follows the interpretation of Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 55.3, not that of the 'others' mentioned with approval by Hugh of St Cher (on 13:2) 364v–365r, who think that that Paschal lamb has already been eaten.

5 That the meal recorded in this chapter also included at some point the institution of the Eucharist described in the synoptics (Matt 26:26–30, Mark 14:22–6, Luke 22:14–20) is universally agreed by Erasmus' sources; cf the dedicatory letter, 3 above. Erasmus' reference here to the 'perpetual memory' of Jesus echoes 1 Cor 11:24–5. For his theology of the Eucharist, cf the references cited in the paraphrase on 6:11 and 51 nn15 and 69.

6 In the annotation on 13:4 (*et ponit vestimenta sua*) Erasmus remarks that the clothes mentioned are only the outer garments; Jesus was not completely naked. For the reference to the apppearance of a servant cf Phil 2:7, a passage adduced here by Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 55.7.

7 Cf Luke 7:44.

8 In this passage, as throughout the episode, Erasmus explicitly attaches Jesus' actions and words to the theme of fitness for preaching the gospel, that is, to the standards of clerical character and behaviour. Cf the paraphrase on 6:3 and n6. Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 57.1–2 also applies the account of the foot-washing to a discussion of those who feel called to preach. Nicholas of Lyra (eg on 13:1, 13:2, 13:8) 224v–225r makes numerous references to Jesus' actions as exemplary for prelates and religious superiors. The theme is emphasized again in the paraphrase on 13:10; cf n16 below.

9 That the point here is humility is stressed by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 70.2 and 71.1–2 (on 13:15), Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 9 (on 13:2–5) PG 74 113A–C, Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 56.3–5, and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 13:2–5).

10 Cf the Apostles' Creed.

11 The Baptist's reluctance to baptize Jesus is told in Matt 3:14.

161

12 'Driving out one nail with another': *veluti clavum clavo pelleret*. This is one of Erasmus' adages, *Adagia* I ii 4: *Clavum clavo pellere* 'To drive out one nail by another.'

13 In his discussion of a later part of this chapter Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 72.3 notes that the feelings of those who are closely attached are heightened when they must part. Cf the paraphrase on 13:36.

14 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 70.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 13:8–9) take note of Peter's passion in yielding, equal to or greater than that with which he had refused. Chrysostom also mentions the impossibility of teaching Peter at this moment, as Erasmus has done a few sentences earlier.

15 Erasmus repeats 'continually' twice more in the next sentence. Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 56 and 57 also emphasizes the ongoing nature of the washing required.

16 For the idea that it is the gospel preacher in particular who needs this extra washing, cf Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 57.1–2, Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 13:10), the *Gloss* (on 13:10) 225r, and Hugh of St Cher (on 13:10) 336r.

17 'Desires of his heart': *affectus animi*. The *affectus* or *affectiones* are also the allegorical explanation of the feet given by Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 56.3–5, Hugh of St Cher (on 13:10) 366r, and Nicholas of Lyra (on 13:10) 225r.

162

18 Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 9 (on 13:10–11) PG 74 120D–121B here remarks that Jesus wishes to prick Judas' conscience and that he neither betrays Judas to the others nor in any way excludes him from the meal and the foot-washing, in the hope that he might repent. Cyril quotes Ezek 18:32.

19 Cf Matt 20:26–7. Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 71.1–2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 13:12–16) say that the apostles will particularly need the humility Jesus is teaching when they are honoured for their achievements. Erasmus gives specific examples in the following sentences.

20 'One who is appointed ... by whom he was appointed': *nec qui legatus est ... a quo legatus fuit*. In the annotation on 13:16 (*nec apostolus maior est eo qui misit*

illum) Erasmus had commented that the Evangelist here had made an allusion in content but not in choice of vocabulary to the similarity of meanings in the Greek words ἀπόστολος 'apostle,' 'one sent with instructions,' and πέμπειν 'send'; Erasmus would have liked to render the thought by a verbal play on *legare* 'delegate.' Here in the paraphrase he does so.

163

21 For 'rear his head' cf the description of the wicked man attacking God in Job 15:26 (Vulgate).

22 Though in the annotation on 13:18 (*levabit super me calcaneum suum*, 1516–27, and *levabit contra me*, 1535) Erasmus had noted that the Vulgate quotation of Ps 41:9 here is not in the same tense as its Greek original, and that the Greek version in 13:18 in any case is not that of the text of the psalm in either the Septuagint or Jerome's translation, he makes only one adjustment in his paraphrase: instead of saying, with the Vulgate of 13:18, 'eats bread with me' he follows the Greek of the verse and says 'eats my bread.'

23 The minatory tone of this and the two preceding sentences is not paralleled in the Gospel, but Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 9 (on 13:20) PG 74 133A–D says that Jesus is using a rhetorical device here, mild words whose real point is to set forth the opposite and more threatening idea.

24 Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 60.5 suggests as one possibility for Jesus' perturbation of spirit here his pity that Judas must perish; Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 72.1 says that Jesus is moved by the thought of the benefits from which Judas is excluding himself. Both are quoted by Hugh of St Cher (on 13:21) 367v.

25 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 72.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 13:21, 22) remark that each disciple is sure of his own innocence, but is troubled by the necessary truth of what Jesus says. Nicholas of Lyra (on 13:22) 225v adds that each thinks of his comrades as he does of himself.

164

26 For the heat of Peter's feeling for the Lord, cf the paraphrase on 13:36 and n42 below.

27 The rebuke to Peter as to Satan: Matt 16:23, Mark 8:33; the refusal of a share: 13:8. Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 72.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 13:23–6) also say that Peter has John make the inquiry about the traitor's identity because he has been rebuked earlier for his impulsiveness.

28 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 72.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 13:23–6) say that Jesus is soothing the grief of his disciple in the scene described in 13:23.

29 That this exchange takes place out of the hearing of the other disciples is noted by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 72.1 and Nicholas of Lyra (on 13:25) 225v.

30 'In the broth': *iuri*, 'broth,' 'pan-drippings.' Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 62.3, followed by the *Gloss* and Nicholas of Lyra (on 13:26) 225v, says that the dipping of the bread here is not part of the institution of the Eucharist at this meal, which had taken place earlier; cf n4 above. In the annotation on 13:27 (*post buccellam*) Erasmus says that ψωμίον in the Greek text of 13:26 and 27

means a bit of bread dipped *iuri;* so he adds the word in the paraphrase to make clear the separation between this sharing of bread and the eucharistic communion.

31 Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 62.2 says that Satan had entered Judas earlier, according to Luke 22:3–4, but that now he possesses the traitor as his own. So Erasmus speaks of 'his whole heart.' Cf also Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 13:26–30).

165

32 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 72.2 says that it was Jesus' habit to send Judas on errands of mercy to the poor and that his purpose in doing so was to teach us to care for the poor.

33 The connection between the darkness of night and the darkness of greed that gripped Judas is made by Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 13:26–30). Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 62.6 and 63.2 and Hugh of St Cher (on 13:30) 368r point to Jesus here as the light from which Judas separates himself. Judas' eagerness for the wicked deed is shown by his disregard of the late hour, according to Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 72.2.

34 In this sentence Erasmus explains the purpose not only of Jesus' speech in the remainder of the chapter but of the entire 'farewell discourse,' 13:31–17:26. Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 72.3 observes that the disciples will promptly forget much of what they are told now, and are depressed to the point of falling asleep, but that they will understand it all better when they remember it later.

35 Cf 12:27.

36 These three exclusions, of angels, archangels, or any other created thing, are also specified by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 72.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 13:31, 32).

166

37 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 72.2 explains the expression in 13:32 'he will soon glorify him' as meaning by death on the cross; Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 13:31, 32) adds to the cross the resurrection and ascension.

38 The text of 13:33 itself points out the similarity between what Jesus is saying to the disciples here and what he had said to the Jews at 7:33–4 and 8:21; the difference in tone, determined by the difference in audience and by Jesus' purpose of comforting rather than threatening, is pointed out by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 72.3 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 13:33–5).

39 For this sentence, not strictly paralleling anything in 13:34 but an elaboration on 'as I have loved you,' cf 13:1: 'Since he loved his own who were in the world, he loved them to the end.' For its interpretation of Jesus' love for his disciples as in fact for their salvation, cf Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 65.2, who says that Jesus loved God in us, not that God was in us but that he might be in us. 'To the point of death' seems to be a different interpretation of 'to the end' (cf n3 above) that alludes to 15:13; Hugh of St Cher (on 13:34) 368v points out that the new thing in the commandment is not love of one's neighbour but love to the point of laying down one's life for the neighbour.

40 The comment about the disciples of others has no parallel at this point in

Erasmus' sources. Its context is Erasmus' often-expressed disapproval of the superstitious formalities of religious life in his own time. Cf eg the annotation on 13:35 (*in hoc cognoscent omnes, quod mei discipuli estis, si dilecti, etc*), where he inveighs at length against such practices; 'To the pious reader' appended to this *Paraphrase*, 228 below; and the colloquy *Exequiae seraphicae* 'The Seraphic Funeral.'

41 Cf Matt 7:17–20 and 12:33, Luke 6:43–4.

42 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 73.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 13:36–8) also speak here of Peter's feelings as (metaphorically) heated.

43 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 72.3 had said in his remarks on 13:33 that we love our loved ones most when they must leave us; cf n13 above.

167

44 Peter's strong love but ignorance of his own weakness is underlined here by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 73.1, Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 66.1–2, and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 13:36–8). All three also point out Jesus' intention in what follows to teach Peter what he does not know about himself; so Erasmus in the next sentence.

45 These three earlier examples of Jesus' teaching and correction of Peter's impulsiveness are reported at Matt 16:22–3 and Mark 8:32–3, Matt 14:28–31, and John 13:6–10 respectively. Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 73.1 also mentions the first and third examples at this point, but not the second.

Chapter 14

1 'You': the editions of 1523, 1524, and 1534 read *nos* 'us' here, not *vos* 'you.' The change was made in 1535.

2 In the annotation on 14:1 (*creditis in deum*) Erasmus observes that the Greek of this sentence twice uses a verb form that could be either indicative or imperative, permitting four possible translations: 1/ 'Believe in God, believe also in me' (both imperative); 2/ 'You believe in God, and you believe in me' (both indicative); 3/ 'You believe in God, believe also in me' (indicative and imperative); 4/ 'Believe in God, and you believe in me (imperative and indicative). The annotation expresses no preference for any one of them. In the paraphrase these two sentences presuppose the third alternative, which is the Vulgate reading also.

168

3 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 73.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 14:2, 3) say that Jesus wants to reassure the disciples that Peter is not the only one who will be received in the Father's house, as they might have supposed from 13:36 'you will follow me later.'

4 The text, punctuation, and interpretation of 14:2 have been historically problematic. See Brown AB *John* 619–20 and Nestle-Aland 26th ed. In the annotation on 14:2 (*quia vado parare*) Erasmus says that the verse should be translated 'In my Father's house are many dwellings. If it were otherwise, I would have said to you, "I am going to prepare a place for you,"' or 'I

would have said that I am going to prepare a place for you.' He also says that he disagrees with the punctuation of Valla in his *Annotationes*, who reads the clause 'I go to prepare a place for you' as a new sentence (844). Erasmus asserts that the logical sequel to his preferred translation is 'as it is, there is no need, because they are prepared, and are waiting for your arrival.' This idea appears in the next sentence of the paraphrase. Erasmus' interpretation thus follows that of Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 73.1 and Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 9 (on 14:2, 3) PG 74 181D–184A; Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 14:2, 3) agrees only in part.

5 In consequence of Chrysostom's interpretation of 14:2 and his own explanation in the annotation on the verse (cf the previous note), Erasmus here reinterprets the Greek future condition of 14:3 'if I go away and prepare' as contrary to fact; he has Jesus assert in effect that he is not going to prepare a place because that is already done. Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 67.2 and 68.1 explains that the places are both already prepared and yet to be prepared.

6 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 73.2 also treats Jesus' enigmatic statements here as part of his pedagogical method.

169

7 For the explanation in this and the preceding sentence of 'way' as deeds, 'truth' as faith, and 'life' as immortality, cf Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 9 (on 14:5, 6) PG 74 189D: 'For we will ascend to the heavenly dwellings above, and to the assembly of the first-born through three things; that is, through doing all kinds of good deeds, and through faith in uprightness, and through hope in life.'

8 'You already do know': *iam ... cognovistis*. Erasmus here uses the verb in the perfect tense with present meaning (a regular use of *cognoscere*) to translate the Greek present γιγνώσκετε, though the Vulgate has a future form, *cognoscetis*. In the annotation on 14:7 (*et amodo cognoscetis*) he had remarked that the correct translation would have been the present, *cognoscitis*, which he had in fact found in some old Latin manuscripts. He may have changed his mind by the time of the *Paraphrase* because the Latin verb more commonly than its Greek counterpart means 'come to know' in the present tenses, not 'know.'

9 Of the sorts of miracles listed here, only two are actually represented in this Gospel, the dispelling of disease (in 5:1–9 and 9:1–7) and summoning of the dead to life (in 11:1–44). The calming of storms is not part of the Gospel account of 6:16–21, though the paraphrase on 6:21 implies it as part of the story; cf n31 on that passage. The power over demons is demonstrated in such synoptic accounts as Matt 9:32–4, Mark 7:25–30, Luke 4:33–5, and the synoptics also contain many further examples of the other sorts.

10 'You still do not know': *nondum cognovisti*. Erasmus uses a singular verb here, addressing only Philip, like the Greek text of 14:9. In the annotation on 14:9 (*et non cognovistis*) he points out that the Vulgate plural verb is not supported by the Greek or by Chrysostom (*Hom in Joannem* 74.1).

170

11 For this sentence, and indeed much of the discussion here of the relation between Father and Son in the godhead, cf the anti-Sabellian and anti-

Arian remarks of Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 74.1, Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 71.1, and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 14:8, 9).

12 Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 70.3 also observes on this verse that belief overcomes the deficiency of sight.

13 Following the contemporary Vulgate text of 14:11, Erasmus has Jesus address the same question to the other disciples as he had addressed to Philip in 14:10. But in the annotation on 14:11 (*non creditis quia ego in patre et pater in me est*) he had pointed out that Chrysostom (*Hom in Joannem* 74.2) and Cyril (*Comm in Joannem* 9 (on 14:11) PG 74 213D) quote the text without the negative and as a command, not a question: 'Believe that I am in the Father,' etc. Such a reading of the Greek text is accommodated at the beginning of the next paragraph, 'So believe this,' etc.
The second part of this sentence, 'there is no distinction between the two of us,' was criticized by the Paris theologian Noël Béda as being a Sabellian idea. Erasmus defended the statement with some sarcasm in the *Elenchus* LB IX 501E and the *Supputatio* LB IX 634A–F, pointing out that the whole passage has to do with the consensus of words and deeds between Father and Son, and that the earlier part of the speech beginning 'with what brashness' had addressed the very question of Sabellianism.

14 For the idea that Jesus is better perceived apart from his physical presence, cf Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 68.3, on the beginning of this chapter, and the closing words of Erasmus' own *Paraclesis* LB V 144D.

15 This interpretation, that the 'greater things' of 14:12 are greater because in them divinity will act through merely human agents, is one of three proposed by Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 71.3; cf also Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 74.2.

171

16 The contemporary Vulgate text, as Erasmus pointed out in the annotation on 14:13 (*et quodcumque petieritis patrem*) included a reference to the Father that is not supported by the Greek text, or by Augustine (*Tract in Joannem* 71, 72, 73), or by Erasmus' older Latin texts. He does, however, maintain here an interpretation that accommodates the Vulgate reading.

17 Erasmus' introduction here of Jesus as advocate, based on 1 John 2:1, is noteworthy because in what follows he resolutely avoids 'advocate' as an interpretation of the name and function of the Paraclete. Cf n20 below.

18 Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 9 (on 14:14) PG 74 249C–252B also introduces the Holy Spirit into the exegesis of 14:14.

19 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 75.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 14:15–17) both explain that Jesus' urging the disciples for love's sake to keep his commandments is intended to refer to the impropriety of their grief at his departure.

20 'Comforter': *consolatorem*. In the annotation on 14:16 (*et alium paraclitum*) Erasmus had said, 'It would have been better to translate [paraclete as] "comforter" here, lest someone think that there were two paracletes. For what he has said till now he said to comfort; so Christ was a paraclete. Then he promises that he will send the other comforter, that is, the Spirit of truth.' But both Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 9 (on 14:16–17) PG 74 257A and Augustine *Tract*

in Joannem 74.4 had said, on the basis of 1 John 2:1, that 'paraclete' here means 'advocate.' Augustine later, in discussing 16:5–7, extends the meaning of 'paraclete' to include 'comforter' as well as 'advocate,' *Tract in Joannem* 94.2; and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 14:15–17 and 25, 26) explains the Paraclete's function as being consolation. While the interlinear *Gloss* (on 14:16) 228v gives both 'advocate' and 'comforter' as explanations of 'paraclete,' Hugh of St Cher (on 14:16) 371r and Nicholas of Lyra (on 14:16) 228v have only 'comforter.' Erasmus continues with 'comforter' in the rest of this chapter. Cf n17 above.

21 'Does not see' implies a present tense verb in 14:17, following the Greek text, not the perfect tense of the contemporary Vulgate; cf the annotation on 14:17 (*quoniam non vidit eum*), which points out the mistake in tense. In the same annotation Erasmus observes that the Vulgate's future tense 'he will remain with you' in 14:17 should also be present, like the Greek verb it translates, though he allows that the Greek might have suffered a minor change that caused a future to seem to be present. His paraphrase (in the sentence 'But if you spurn ...') maintains the future.

22 Cf the manifestation of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost, Acts 2:1–4.

172

23 For a patron in the house of a dependent, *patronus apud clientem*, cf Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 74 5, who similarly denies the relevance of the image of a guest at someone's house, *apud hominem hospes*. These explanations are apparently motivated by the Vulgate wording *apud vos manebit*, 'he will remain with you,' for the Latin *apud*, like the French *chez*, means 'at the house of.' The verse is understood to describe the permanent indwelling of the Spirit by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 75.1–2, Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 74 5, and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 14:15–17).

24 'Dear children': *filioli*, added from 13:33. Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 75.1–2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 14:18–20) comment that Jesus calls the disciples 'orphans' in 14:18 because he had called them his children at 13:33. Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 75.1 remarks on 'orphans' that Jesus is displaying his own fatherly feelings for his followers.

25 For the language of nurture from infancy to maturity in the gospel, cf eg 1 Cor 3:1–2, Hebr 5:12–14, 1 Peter 2:2.

26 'I will visit you ... and show' paraphrases the Vulgate's 'you will see me,' though Erasmus had pointed out in the annotation on 14:19 (*vos autem videbitis*) that the Vulgate verb ought to be present, since it translates a Greek present.

27 The text of 14:20, paraphrased in this sentence, contains three rhetorically equivalent expressions: 'I am in the Father, and you are in me, and I am in you.' The paraphrase, however, establishes two pairs – 'nothing can tear the Father away from me or me from the Father,' and 'I will be so attached to you ... and you in turn to me'; with respect to the second pair only it specifies the method of attachment, 'by our shared love,' and the real possibility in its absence of the dissolution of the tie, 'death.' Cf Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 75.2, who points out that Jesus is in God by reason of the divine substance but in his disciples by reason of his aid and his unanimity with

them; he goes on to discuss the essential difference between God and human. Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 14:18–20) has a similar treatment. Hugh of St Cher (on 14:20) 371v makes a brief statement of the distinction noted by Chrysostom.

28 For the three-step process of reception, remembering, and carrying out of the commandments, cf Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 10 (on 14:21) PG 74 285B–C.

29 The same comment is made here by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 75.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 14:21, 22).

30 Bearing injuries: Matt 5:39–45, Luke 6:27–35; taking up one's cross: Matt 10:38 and 16:24, Mark 8:34, Luke 9:23 and 14:27. Hugh of St Cher (on 14:21) 371v quotes Matt 16:24 here.

173

31 This sentence, Erasmus' explication of 'I will manifest myself' in 14:21, mentions three forms of manifestation: post-resurrection appearances, the indwelling Spirit, and the second coming. The first is also the explanation of Nicholas of Lyra (on 14:21) 229r. The second is Erasmus' explanation in the annotation on 14:21 (*et manifestabo ei me ipsum*) of the Greek word for *manifestabo*, ἐμφανίσω, 'which rather means to show quietly and secretly ... It is more congruent with the inspiration whereby God winds his way into the hearts of his own.' For the third, cf the paraphrase on 1:51 and n160.

32 The alternative or additional name Lebbaeus is given for Thaddaeus in some Greek texts of the lists of disciples in Matt 10:3 and Mark 3:18; Erasmus' own text of Matt 10:3 in his New Testament editions reads *et Lebbaeus cognomento Thaddaeus* καὶ Λεββαῖος ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς Θαδδαῖος 'and Lebbaeus surnamed Thaddaeus.' The Judas who is not the Iscariot but the son (or brother) of James is in the lists of disciples in Luke 6:16 and Acts 1:13. The identification of Thaddaeus/Lebbaeus with this Judas appears in Jerome's *Commentarius in evangelium secundum Matthaeum* 10.4 PL 26 63, where Jerome says of Thaddaeus that he 'is called Judas son of James by the evangelist Luke, and elsewhere is named Lebbaeus ... we are to believe that he had three names, like Simon Peter.' Erasmus repeated the observation about three names for this disciple in his annotation on Matt 10:2 (*primus Simon*); and in the annotation on Matt 10:3 (*Lebbaeus cognominatus*) he argued that the presence of 'Lebbaeus' in Jerome's list for Matthew in *De nominibus hebraicis* (CCL 72 137) shows that Jerome too read it in the Matthew passage.

33 That Judas is alarmed at the prospect of seeing Jesus in ghost-like form or in a dream is also suggested by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 75.2–3, Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 14:21, 22), and Hugh of St Cher (on 14:22) 371v–372r.

34 There is no mention of the Spirit in 14:23, but Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 76.4 says the Spirit is to be understood here, and Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 10 (on 14:23) PG 74 289D–293B likewise has an extensive discussion of the role of the Spirit in the promised visitation of Father and Son.

35 Cf Rom 8:38–9.

36 For Christ as the head and believers as the members, cf eg Eph 4:15, Col 1:18.

174

37 It is noteworthy that Erasmus uses *praecepta* 'commandments'

(borrowed from 15:10 and 12) and *doctrina* 'teaching' in paraphrasing 14:24, since the words in the Vulgate text are *sermo* and *sermones*, and Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 76.5 states the identity of *sermo* in this verse with *verbum* in 1:1. Cf the paraphrases on chapter 1 n16 and on chapter 6 n50.

38 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 75.3 implies and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 14:25, 26) clearly states that the Paraclete will come as a comforter. Cf n20 above. The comforting function is also emphasized here by the *Gloss* (on 14:26) 229r and Hugh of St Cher (on 14:26) 373v.

39 That the peace Jesus gives reconciles us to God (as Erasmus said two sentences previously) is noted by Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 10 (on 14:27) PG 74 305B–D; that it links believers to each other is the observation of Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 77.5 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 14:27). Cf the paraphrase on 1 Cor 1:3, where concord that 'reconciles you to one another' is one of Erasmus' explications of the 'peace' in that verse.

175

40 In what follows Erasmus elaborates on 'this world' as referring to those who are in bondage to sin, not to the entire created universe; similar explanations are made here by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 75.4, Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 79.2, and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 14:30, 31).

41 Erasmus uses the editorial 'we' here; in the Gospel text of 14:30 Jesus speaks of himself in the singular, 'I.' The Evangelist himself had used the same editorial 'we' at 3:11.

42 The Gospel text of chapter 14 ends with these words and begins again at 15:1 with Jesus' next words, 'I am the vine,' etc. Erasmus inserts a substantial passage which reviews all that Jesus has said since the departure of Judas Iscariot, and also explains Jesus' purposes in speaking as he does and in moving his disciples to another location. One view, represented by eg Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 10 (on 14:31) PG 74 329D–332A, Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 79.2, Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 15:1–3), and the interlinear *Gloss* (on 14:31) 229v, was that the group moves at this point to the garden where Judas will find them; but the view followed below by Erasmus is that the move is not to the place of betrayal but to a more secure location to allay the disciples' immediate fears about the imminent danger: so Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 76.1 and Nicholas of Lyra (on 14:31) 229v.

43 A similar 'spiritual' interpretation of the exhortation to rise and go is given by Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 10 (on 14:31) PG 74 332A–C.

176

44 Hugh of St Cher (on 14:31) 374r also observes at about this place that Jesus repeats the bitter news of his departure again and again to accustom his hearers to it.

45 'Metaphor': *similitudo*. Erasmus evidently has in mind the formal resemblance between 15:1–8 and 10:1–16; cf the paraphrase on 10:1–16 and nn2, 4, and 14 there. In some prefatory remarks to his treatment of the beginning of chapter 15, Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 80.1 discusses the *similitudo* of the vine in the context of the other metaphors Jesus uses of himself in Scripture.

Chapter 15

177

1 With this sentence Erasmus introduces into the metaphor an element not present in the Gospel version: the sap, which he allegorizes as the Holy Spirit. He maintains this element in the other passages of the chapter where the metaphor is prominent, eg the paraphrases on 15:4–6 and 16. Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 10 (on 15:2) PG 74 349D and (on 15:4) PG 74 361C calls the Spirit, among other things, the moisture of the vine; and Hugh of St Cher (on 15:1–4) 374v–375r refers more than once to the sap without any mention of an allegorical meaning.

2 Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 10 (on 15:2) PG 74 352A says that lusts are one of the two categories of evils to be pruned away. Nicholas of Lyra (on 15:2) 230r says that 'the hearts of the faithful are pruned of pleasure in this life and trained away from the love of worldly things.'

3 'Will be cut away,' like 'will be pruned' in the preceding sentence, paraphrases a future tense verb in the contemporary Vulgate of 15:2, though Erasmus had commented in the annotation on 15:2 (*omnem palmitem in me non ferentem fructum tollet*) that the Greek verbs were both present tense, implying not an action located in a specific time but a general truth.

4 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 76.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 15:1–3) observe that more pruning of vines means higher yields of fruit. It is noteworthy that Erasmus' usual sources nearly all discuss the nature of the pruning and agree that it is tribulation and affliction; but the paraphrase leaves the question untouched.

5 For the metaphorical fruit of the believer's life as good works, cf Col 1:10; so Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 76.1 and 2, Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 15:1–3).

6 In the annotation on 15:6 (*et colligent eum*) Erasmus notes that the contemporary Vulgate's 'gather it' in the verse is a mistake for the Greek 'gather them'; so in the paraphrase he accommodates both the Latin singular ('a branch') and the Greek plural ('the rest of the cuttings').

7 In this paragraph, paraphrasing 15:6, Erasmus disregards the contemporary Vulgate's future tense verbs for the gnomic aorists and presents of the Greek text of 15:6. In his three annotations on 15:6 (*mittetur foras, et colligent eum, mittent*) Erasmus had noted that the Latin futures were probably a scribe's mistake for presents.

178

8 The contrast between the great numbers of Old Testament and Pharisaic commandments and the single commandment of Jesus is drawn here by Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 15:11–13).

179

9 'Slaves': *servi*, for the Greek δοῦλοι and traditionally translated 'servants' in English scriptural language (as in the next sentence); cf the ubiquitous phrase in the Old Testament translated into English as 'servant of the Lord.'

10 Cf the self-description by the centurion of a superior giving instructions to his subordinates, Matt 8:9.

11 By speaking of 'the whole intention' of Jesus' heart and 'whatever the Father wanted [the disciples] to know,' Erasmus adopts the explanation offered by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 77.1 for the inconsistency between 15:15, where Jesus says he has made known all that he heard from his Father, and 16:12, where he says that he has more to say but that they cannot yet bear it. According to Chrysostom, Jesus means that he has said nothing in opposition to the Father, and everything that the disciples ought to hear.

180

12 'Before you': *prior vobis*, the same expression used by the Vulgate in 15:18, and one as ambiguous as its Greek original, πρῶτον ὑμῖν. As Erasmus commented in the annotation on 15:18 (*me priorem vobis*) it could refer to priority in either rank or time. In the annotation he preferred the connotation of time, but in the paraphrase he evades the question.

13 'Like loves like' is a proverb familiar in many contexts and cultures. Hugh of St Cher (on 15:18) 378r gives a version of it here and quotes Sir 13:15 and 27:9; Nicholas of Lyra (on 15:18) 231r also quotes Sir 13:15. Erasmus himself has the proverb in *Adagia* I ii 21: *Simile gaudet simili* 'Like rejoices in like,' followed by some variants, with many examples from classical authors. As well, there are other variants scattered throughout the *Adagia*. But there does not seem to be any parallel for Erasmus' *mala scabies amat commode scalpentem* 'a bad itch loves a good scratch.'

181

14 Cf Matt 21:37, Mark 12:6, Luke 20:13.

182

15 The thought here, of the evident necessity of forgiveness for one who hates a person not known to him (repeated at the end of the next paragraph), depends on the comment of Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 90.1–3 on the problem implicit in 15:21 and 23, how we can hate what we do not know. According to Augustine, we may hate someone unknown to us because we have heard that he has moral flaws, when in fact he does not; we are right to hate the flaws but are mistaken in our judgment of the person alleged to possess them and so think that we hate the person we do not know. This is a forgivable human temptation. The *Gloss* (on 15:23) 231v repeats Augustine's explanation.

16 Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 91.2–3 points out that many of the kinds of miracles Jesus did were also done by the prophets, and that the prophets did some he did not do; 'but no one at all of the ancients is reported to have used such great power to heal so many flaws and sicknesses and afflictions of mortals.' The *Gloss* (on 15:24) 231v describes the uniqueness of Jesus' miracles in the same way.

17 The quotation as given in the text of 15:25 is only 'who hate me without reason,' a phrase found in both Ps 35:19 and 69:4. But Erasmus gives here a

fuller text of Ps 35:19. Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 10 (on 15:24) PG 74 416B had also expanded his discussion of the quotation as found in the Gospel with further quotation from the same verses of the psalms, though not all that Erasmus gives here. In the annotation on 15:25 (*odio habuerunt me gratis*), however, Erasmus had said the prophecy was from Ps 69.

18 Cf n15.

19 Erasmus again identifies the Paraclete, for the purposes of this episode, as a comforter only; cf the paraphrase on 14:16 and n20. The interlinear *Gloss* (on 15:26) 231v and Hugh of St Cher (on 15:26) 379r also say that 'paraclete' here means 'comforter,' though Hugh acknowledges 'advocate' as another possible meaning.

183

20 The paraphrase maintains the future tense of the contemporary Vulgate, though in the annotation on 15:27 (*et vos testimonium perhibebitis*) Erasmus had noted that the Greek original was not future but either imperative or (as he preferred) indicative present.

Chapter 16

1 Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 93.1, followed by the *Gloss* (on 16:1) 231v and Hugh of St Cher (on 16:1) 379v, comments here that Jesus uses his own sufferings as an example of the sufferings the disciples will face. Erasmus elaborates the Gospel text to emphasize teaching, not merely believing in, the gospel as the reason for the persecutions to be suffered by the disciples. Cf the paraphrase on 17:21 and n25.

2 Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 10 (on 16:1) PG 74 421C (and on 16:2 and 16:4 as well) remarks that pain and grief are more easily borne when they have been contemplated before they actually occur. The same thought is found in Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 93.4, and in the treatment of the end of this chapter by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 79.1.

3 For the prisons and beatings inserted here by Erasmus between the Gospel text's expulsions from the synagogues and executions, cf eg Acts 16:22–4, 2 Cor 11:23–5.

184

4 That the error of the disciples' Jewish persecutors is in their judgment, not their feeling, is the observation of Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 93.4, who quotes Rom 10:2 and also points out the numbers of Jews converted at the time of Pentecost. Erasmus' next sentence alludes to the conversion of Jews.

5 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 77.3 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 16:1–4) say here that Jesus had two reasons for wanting the disciples to remember his words: so that they could mitigate their pain by anticipating it (cf just above, the paraphrase on 16:1 and n2), and so that they could later come to realize his divine foreknowledge of events. Nicholas of Lyra (on 16:4) 232r has a similar comment. Both reasons are implied in Erasmus' paraphrase.

6 Cf Matt 5:11–12, quoted here by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 77.3, Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 16:1–4), and Hugh of St Cher (on 16:4) 379v.

7 Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 94.2 and 4 here makes extensive use of the metaphor of food and nurture for infants to explain the effect of Jesus' earthly life on his disciples; he continues the metaphor in *Tract in Joannem* 96, 97, and 98. The image is common in the Epistles, where it refers to the beginning levels of the apostolic teaching. Cf the paraphrase on 14:18 and n25.

8 These terms are usually used of the Paraclete, as Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 94.2 says here; but he goes on to explain that a comforter and advocate was not needed as long as Jesus was on earth. The interlinear *Gloss* (on 16:4) 232r interprets 'because I was with you' in the Gospel text to mean 'I was your paraclete.' Erasmus has been assiduously avoiding 'advocate' as a synonym for the Paraclete and using it only to describe Jesus; cf the paraphrase on 14:14 and 16 nn17 and 20, the paraphrase on 15:26 and n19, and the paraphrase on 16:7 just below.

185

9 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 78.1, Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 10 (on 16:5–6) PG 74 429B, and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 16:5–7) all point out that the disciples' desire is for Jesus to stay with them permanently; Chrysostom adds that Jesus does not say what they want to hear but what is good for them, as Erasmus says in the next sentence.

10 Cf n8 above.

11 For the higher, interior gifts of the Holy Spirit, and their availability only after Jesus' departure from his earthly life, cf Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 94.4.

12 Cf the paraphrase on 1:12 and n65.

13 Cf Eph 1:10.

14 Alluding to 14:12; cf the paraphrase on 14:12 and n15.

186

15 The events itemized in this sentence can all be illustrated either from the various post-crucifixion narratives in the Gospels: Matt 28:9 and 16–20, Mark 16:9–20, Luke 24, John 20–1, or from Acts: the ascension, 1:9–11; sending the Spirit and preaching, 2:1–13; demons dispelled, 16:16–18; the lame made whole, 3:1–8; the sick healed, 19:11–12; the dead brought back to life, 9:36–41. For the sentence itself, cf Luke 7:22 and Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 78.1 on this passage: 'And when they see death undone, evil cast out, lameness from birth corrected, demons driven forth, the ineffable work of the Spirit, and all this done at the invocation of my name, what will they say?'

16 Cf Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 95.2, who says that Jesus puts the sin of unbelief ahead of the rest 'because while this one lasts the rest are retained, and when this one departs, the others are forgiven.' Hugh of St Cher (on 16:9) 380v cites Augustine to the same effect.

17 Cf the 'pure water' of Heb 10:22.

18 Explaining the charge of righteousness in 16:10, Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 95.2 says that the world will be found guilty when its professed righteousness is measured against the true righteousness of believers. For Erasmus' earlier expressions of this theme, cf eg the paraphrases on 4:45, 7:50, 8:33.

187

19 Cf n14.

20 Cf 1:29.

21 Cf Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 95.4, who says that the imitators of the prince of this world will be condemned by the same judgment by which their master had already been condemned.

22 Like Erasmus, Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 78.1, Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 96.4, and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 16:12–14) also give the disciples' weakness as a reason why Jesus does not say all that he could here. Chrysostom and Theophylact add a second reason that has to do with Jesus himself, as Erasmus does here too; their explanation, however, is Jesus' unwillingness to behave in a provocative manner towards the Jews, not the unfinished state of his mission.

23 Erasmus here stays with the Vulgate text, though he comments in the annotation on 16:13 (*docebit vos omnem*) that the Greek word is not 'teach' but 'lead'; Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 96.4 knew this Greek reading too but argued that there was no important difference in meaning for the passage between 'teach' and 'lead.' In the same section of his sermon, Augustine lays emphasis, as Erasmus does in the following sentences, on the interiority of the Spirit's teaching.

188

24 Cf 17:1.

25 Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 100.4, followed by Nicholas of Lyra (on 16:15) 232v, points out that the only exception to the complete sharing between Father and Son is the quality of fatherhood that is the Father's.

26 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 78.3 stresses here not just the equality of Father and Son, as in the Gospel text of 16:15, but the equality of all three Persons of the Trinity.

27 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 79.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 16:16–18) also say that grief is what prevents the disciples' understanding of Jesus' words.

28 The credal expression; cf the paraphrase on 1:51 and n160.

189

29 The interlinear *Gloss* (on 16:19) 232v, Hugh of St Cher (on 16:19) 382v, and Nicholas of Lyra (on 16:19) 232v–233r all point out that Jesus' remarks are evidence of his divine knowledge of human secrets. Cf n37 below.

30 'The Jews' paraphrases 'the world' in 16:20; Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 16:19–22) observes that 'the world' here means worldly Jews.

31 Erasmus' word translated here as 'child' and 'baby' is *proles* 'offspring,' 'young.' The Greek text uses παιδίον 'child' and ἄνθρωπος 'human being.' Neither Erasmus' word nor the Greek παιδίον (which is neuter) implies anything about the sex of the new-born. But for 'child' the Vulgate uses *puer*, which means primarily 'boy' and only secondarily 'child' of either sex; consequently Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 101.5 has much to say about the allegorical significance of the new-born's being a (more desired) male rather than a (less desired) female. He is followed by the interlinear *Gloss* (on 16:21) 233r and Hugh of St Cher (on 16:21) 383v.

32 For Erasmus' presentation of Jesus as advocate, cf n8 above.

190

33 Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 102.4 explains that to someone who has only a corporeal understanding even what is said clearly and plainly about incorporeal truths will seem to be a kind of parable, because that person is used to not understanding parables when he hears them. He makes a similar comment on 16:29, *Tract in Joannem* 103.1.

34 Cf 14:26.

35 No such example is used to illustrate the point here by any of Erasmus' usual sources; he seems to be drawing on contemporary social customs and his own personal experience.

36 Cf the paraphrase on 16:7 and n12.

191

37 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 79.1, Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 103.2, and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 16:29–32) all point here to the disciples' recognition of Jesus' omniscience as a sign of his divinity, but Erasmus himself had introduced the motif earlier, in the paraphrase on 16:19.

38 Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 103.3 comments at the conclusion of this chapter on the disciples' steadfastness after the resurrection and ascension.

Chapter 17

192

1 For the twin themes of comfort and preparation in Jesus' words to this point, cf the paraphrase on 13:31 and n34. Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 11 (on 17:1) PG 74 476A also comments on the purpose of Jesus' preceding words, but takes note only of their function as preparation of the disciples.

2 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 80.1 observes that Jesus' prayer here serves to teach by his action what he had just taught in words; and that his physical act of lifting his eyes in prayer teaches us to lift our hearts. Cf the paraphrase on 9:1 and n1. Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 104.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 17:1–3) also comment on the didactic and exemplary purpose of Jesus' prayer.

3 Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 104.3 says that the glorification of Jesus is only by the resurrection (his death being his humiliation), but Nicholas of Lyra (on 17:1) 234r says, 'He was glorified by his passion, in so far as by it he earned the glory and exaltation of the body.'

4 Anticipating 17:3; Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 105.1–3 says here that the glorification to be received by the Father, who in himself needs no glory (as Erasmus will say in the paraphrase on 17:4), is the increase among all people in knowledge of him that will be effected by the Son's resurrection.

5 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 80.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 17:1–3) both explain that God is the God of both Jews and gentiles.

6 Cf 5:23 and the paraphrase on that verse.

7 While both Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 80.2 and Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 105.4–5 suggest that the perfect tenses of 17:4 ('I have glorified' and 'I

have completed') refer by a common scriptural idiom to future, not past, time, Chrysostom alternatively interprets them as referring to the work Jesus had done in his earthly ministry, preaching and doing miracles. The latter explanation is followed by Erasmus here.

8 Cf n4.

193

9 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 80.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 17:4–6) also explain the Gospel text's 'I have made known' as meaning that Jesus has carried out the necessary preliminary parts of the task to be assigned to the apostles, but they use agricultural metaphors, not building metaphors. Erasmus returns shortly to the vine metaphor of 15:1–8.

10 Hugh of St Cher (on 17:6) 386r explains 'whom you gave me' with the addition 'to be trained.'

11 Cf 3:16.

194

12 Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 107.1 says that 'the world' in 17:9 means 'those who live according to the concupiscence of the world.'

13 Again Erasmus offers a literal interpretation of the perfect tense found in the Gospel text, while Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 107.3 and Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 81.1 take the tense as referring to what will happen in the future (though it is already predestined). Cf n7.

14 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 81.1 points out here the reciprocal glorification of Son by Father as of Father by Son; the Gospel text of 17:10 speaks only of the glorification of Jesus.

15 'Born for perdition': *perditioni natus*. Erasmus' adaptation of the Gospel text's 'son of perdition' reflects his comment in the annotation on 17:12 (*nisi filius perditionis*) that the expression 'of perdition' is an adjectival genitive, not one that describes a son that perdition bore.

16 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 81.2–3 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 17:12, 13) also mention Judas' personal responsibility for being lost.

17 Cf 13:18 and Ps 41:9; Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 107.7, Hugh of St Cher (on 17:12) 387r, and Nicholas of Lyra (on 17:12) 235r cite Ps 109 here, and Nicholas adds Ps 41.

195

18 Cf above, the paraphrase on 17:1 and n1. Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 81.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 17:12, 13) comment here on the consolatory purpose of the prayer in this part.

196

19 Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 11 (on 17:14–15) PG 74 532C–533A and Nicholas of Lyra (on 17:15) 235r say here that the disciples are to stay in the world until their mission is compete and the faith proclaimed world-wide.

20 Erasmus reintroduces the metaphor of 15:1–8; cf n9 above.

21 Cf Hugh of St Cher (on 17:17) 387v, who explains that 'there is no lying in [God's word] … no shadow, nothing typological, no corporality.' Erasmus uses the same kinds of elements in his rhetorical contrast.

22 Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 11 (on 17:18–19) PG 74 540A remarks here, quoting Heb 3:1, that Jesus is sending his disciples into the world on the model of his own apostolate. Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 108.4 explains that 17:18 is a reference to the apostles based on the meaning of the Greek word 'apostle' as 'one who is sent.'

23 'I sacrifice myself as an offering,' interpreting the Gospel text's 'I sanctify myself,' reflects Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 82.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 17:17–19).

197

24 For the vine metaphor, cf nn9 and 20 above; here, as in the paraphrase on 15:1–8, the Spirit is the sap of the vine. Cf the paraphrase on 15:1 n1. Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 11 (on 17:20, 21) PG 74 556A says that the unity Jesus prays for in 17:21 is effected by the Holy Spirit, but Cyril makes no use here of the vine imagery. Erasmus continues to emphasize the function of the Spirit (who is not mentioned in the Gospel text of chapter 17) in what follows.

25 Erasmus' emphasis on unanimity of teaching among the followers of Jesus has ties to his general treatment in this *Paraphrase* of Jesus as training the disciples for the teaching function of episcopacy; cf eg the paraphrase on 6:3 and n6, and on 13:5 and n8. It could well be intended for contemporary application too. His usual sources have only scanty allusions to unanimity of teaching as an element of Christian unity. Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 82.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 17:20, 21) say that Jesus' effectiveness as a teacher will be voided if his disciples quarrel; Hugh of St Cher (on 17:23) 388r says, in a long general description of concord, that believers cannot be united to Father and Son if they disagree among themselves; and Nicholas of Lyra (on 17:22) 235v says that the prayer is that they 'may be in the true unity of the church, and without schism.'

26 Cf eg 1 Cor 12:12–27, Eph 4:15, Col 1:18. Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 110 and 111 makes much use of the imagery of head and body in discussing this part of the chapter.

198

27 Cf Matt 12:24, Mark 3:22, Luke 11:15.

28 Cf 1 Cor 1:26–7. For Erasmus' emphasis on this theme earlier in the *Paraphrase*, cf eg the paraphrases on 4:45, 7:50, 9 (especially on 9:39–41), and 16:1–2.

29 The operation of the Spirit in the spreading knowledge of the Father's name is noted also by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 82.3 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 17:25, 26).

Chapter 18

1 Like Erasmus, Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 83.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 18:1, 2) begin their discussion of the passion account with emphasis on the way the events demonstrate Jesus' unforced willingness to die. Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 11 (on 18:1–6) PG 74 577D–584A refers frequently to the same theme in the account. Erasmus will repeat the theme in what follows.

2 'Whose name in Hebrew means Cedarbrook, from its nature': *cui nomen apud Hebraeos ex re Cedron.* In the annotation on 18:1 (*trans torrentem Cedron*) Erasmus says that the presence in his Greek texts of the genitive plural article *τῶν* with *κεδρῶν* shows that Cedron is not a Hebrew word but the Greek for 'of the cedars,' and that in his view the stream is so called because of the cedars on either bank; the expression is formed like 'Mount of Olives.' In these comments Erasmus is disregarding the view of Jerome, who defined Cedron in his list of names from Jeremiah as 'dolorous grief,' *De nominibus hebraicis* CCL 72 126 (and did not list it with the names from John). Instead Erasmus follows the interlinear *Gloss* (on 18:1) 236r, which explains Cedron as 'the shade of cedars,' and Hugh of St Cher (on 18:1) 388v, who says 'Cedron is genitive plural in Greek ... and the stream is called "Cedarbrook" for the number of cedars around the area.' Similarly Nicholas of Lyra (on 18:1) 236r.

3 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 83.1 explains both the choice of night-time and the armed troop as Erasmus does here; Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 112.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 18:3–6) give the same explanation of the armed troop.

199

4 Erasmus has temporarily overlooked (or expressed very compendiously) the fact that the Gospel text of 18:3 speaks both of a cohort (ie of Roman troops) and of the attendants of the priests and Pharisees; his usual sources, however, are all quite explicit on the Roman and Jewish components of the arresting party. Contrast his language in the paraphrase on 18:12, where he adheres closely to the Gospel text.

5 Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 11 (on 18:4–6) PG 74 584A says that the Evangelist mentions the lanterns to anticipate the objection that the troop would not be able to recognize Jesus in the dark.

6 The traitor's kiss is added from Matt 26:48–9, Mark 14:44–5, Luke 22:47–8. The interlinear *Gloss* (on 18:5) 236r, also adding synoptic material here, explains Judas' presence reported in 18:5 by his intention of betraying Jesus with a kiss.

7 'One time': in the editions of 1523 and 1524 the reading was 'twice.'

8 Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 112.3 also says here that Jesus shows his power over the forces sent against him to demonstrate that his submission to them is entirely an act of his will.

9 This sentence summarizes themes from Jesus' words in the synoptics and in this Gospel. In the synoptics Jesus' prophecies of his death involve only himself, not his followers; cf eg Matt 16:21, Mark 8:31, Luke 9:22. The theme of much of his last discourse, 13:31–17:26, as Erasmus paraphrases it is comfort for the disciples' anticipated grief and assurance of their immediate safety; cf eg 13:31–3, 16:16–22, and the paraphrases on those passages. The 'good shepherd' alludes to 10:11, cited here by Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 11 (on 18:7–9) PG 74 584D and Hugh of St Cher (on 18:8) 389v.

10 The heat of Peter's affection is also noted here by the interlinear *Gloss* (on 18:10) 236r and Hugh of St Cher (on 18:10) 389v: Peter is 'more ardent than the other disciples.' Cf n12 below.

11 Cf 13:37.

12 Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 11 (on 18:10) PG 74 588A describes Peter at this moment as 'hotter than necessary.'

200

13 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 83.2, Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 18:10, 11), and Nicholas of Lyra (on 18:10) 236v say that Peter had intended a more damaging blow, but, as Nicholas adds, 'by divine ordinance the blow slipped sideways.'

14 The healing of the amputated ear is reported in Luke 22:51, cited here by Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 112.5. Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 83.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 18:10, 11) also mention the healing.

15 For the identification of vengeance and its repression as the motif of this episode, cf the *Gloss* (on 18:11) 236v, which comments on Jesus' order to Peter to put up his sword, 'as if he were saying "let vengeance lie quiet."'

16 The passage from 'But the Lord' through 'against unholy men' was criticized by the Paris theologian Noël Béda for what he understood as an implicit attack on the right of princes to bear arms in defence of the church. Erasmus replied in the *Elenchus* LB IX 501E and *Supputatio* LB IX 635A–B that the passage clearly refers to the apostles and their successors, not to princes, and that there can be no dispute about the Christian's being interdicted from vengeance. He refers in the *Supputatio* to a fuller discussion he has given in the annotations on Luke 2, but there is nothing relevant in the annotations on that chapter.

17 Cf Matt 16:22–3, Mark 8:33. 'You heard yourself called Satan' was *audieris videlicet dictus Satanas* in the Latin of the 1523, 1524, and 1534 editions. In the 1535 edition it changed to *audieris Satanas*, an improvement in the elegance of the language without a change in the meaning.

18 Cf Heb 4:12.

19 Cf 17:11, 21, 22.

20 The translation is of Erasmus' 1535 text. But this passage and three additional ones (see below, nn25, 32, 39) underwent revision over the editions of this *Paraphrase* published in Erasmus' lifetime. Erasmus explained the problem and his solution in the 1535 annotation on 18:12 (*cohors autem et tribunus*): the synoptic Gospels make no mention of Annas and have the religious interrogation of Jesus carried out entirely by Caiaphas, at whose house all of Peter's denials take place, while John reports that Jesus was taken first to Annas (where the reported interrogation took place and Peter denied him the first time) and then to Caiaphas (where Peter denied him twice more). The problem greatly exercised Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 113 and others after him. Erasmus finds his solution in Cyril (*Comm in Joannem* 11 (on 18:12–14) PG 74 593B–596A), who, as he says, gives a lemma of 18:13–14 that makes it apparent that something has been lost from the Gospel text. The 'missing' sentence follows 18:13a: 'And they led him to Annas first, for he was the father-in-law of Caiaphas, who was the high priest of that year.' Cyril's lemma then adds 'and they sent him in chains to Caiaphas the high priest' and continues with 18:14: 'And it was Caiaphas who had advised the Jews ...' This solution contradicts eg Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 83.3, who says the Evangelist omitted the details of the interrogation before Caiaphas, and

is not accepted by modern scholars (cf Nestle-Aland 26th ed and eg Brown AB *John* 828–33), but it is the text that Erasmus decided to paraphrase. The history of his alterations is as follows:
1523 and 1524: 'the father-in-law of Caiaphas. Now Caiaphas was the high priest of that year, of whom mention was made earlier ...'
1534: 'the father-in-law of Caiaphas. Now Caiaphas was the high priest of that year, so they took Jesus from Annas' house to Caiaphas, of whom mention was made earlier ...' (The earlier mention is at 11:49–50.)
It is clear that Erasmus decided to change to Cyril's version of the text of 18:13–14 between the 1524 and 1534 editions; the 1535 paraphrase is only a further clarification of the 1534 version. In spite of what he did in the paraphrase and the long explanation in the annotation, Erasmus did not alter the text in his editions of the New Testament.

21 For 'father-in-law' the 1523 edition reads 'son-in-law,' apparently a simple slip of the pen and not related to the changes described in n20.

22 Interrogation by Herod is not part of the story in this Gospel; it is told only in Luke 23:7–12.

201

23 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 83.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 18:12–14) observe here that even Jesus' enemies proclaim his truth.

24 A similar comparison is made here by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 83.2: 'as if setting up a war-trophy.'

25 'That is, to Caiaphas' was added in 1534; cf n20.

26 The anonymous disciple of 18:15 is positively identified as the Evangelist by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 83.2, but Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 113.2 says certainty is impossible. Cf 13:23–5.

27 13:37; cf the paraphrase on 18:10.

28 Peter's twin, and conflicting, motivations of love and fear are also noted here by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 83.2.

29 A similar characterization of the maidservant and her question is in Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 83.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 18:17, 18); more briefly, Nicholas of Lyra (on 18:17) 236v.

30 Noël Béda took umbrage at this statement for its supposed thrust at contemporary court life. Erasmus defended it in the *Elenchus* LB IX 501E–F and at greater length in the *Supputatio* LB IX 635C–E, saying that he was speaking in the person of the Evangelist and thus naturally was referring to the courts of the Jews, not of contemporary princes, and that his exposition follows similar remarks on the subject of courts by Ambrose and Jerome.

202

31 Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 11 (on 18:18) PG 74 597C–D and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 18:17, 18) also say that by warming himself at the fire Peter was trying to make himself inconspicuous.

32 'Caiaphas' in the editions of 1523 and 1524 was 'Annas.' Cf n20.

33 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 83.3 observes that the high priest's questions are hypocritical.

34 'Seeking a handle': *ansam captans*, another application of *Adagia* I iv 4: *Ansam*

quaerere, et consimiles metaphorae 'To look for a handle, and similar metaphors.' Cf chapter 8 n4 and chapter 9 nn28 and 46.

35 The same idea as in the paraphrase on 18:14, repeated here also by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 83.3 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 18:19–23). Cf n23 above.

36 The parallel Erasmus draws here between the behaviour of Peter and that of the high priest's servant is not in his usual sources.

203

37 Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 113.4 here lists a variety of mighty acts by which Jesus could have punished the insult offered him, except that he chose to give us an example of mildness; Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 83.3 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 18:19–23) have similar formulations.

38 Again, the credal affirmation; cf the paraphrase on 16:17 and n28.

39 In the editions of 1523, 1524, and 1534 (this last apparently by inadvertence) instead of the present sentence there was the following: 'Now though Annas, in his wickedness, was glad that Jesus had been taken prisoner, still, since he could not fish out anything on which Jesus could even plausibly be convicted, he sent him, bound as he was, to Caiaphas the high priest, his son-in-law.' Cf n20.

40 Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 113.6, followed by the interlinear *Gloss* and Nicholas of Lyra (on 18:25) 237r, points out that the narrative returns here to resume the account of Peter at the point where it had left him. Erasmus in the person of the Evangelist breaks into the story to mark the transition.

41 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 83.3, Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 12 (on 18:24–7) PG 74 608B–612A, and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 18:24–7) all comment here on the pedagogical purpose of Peter's denials: they bring Peter (and us) to admit helplessness apart from God.

204

42 Jesus' glance towards Peter, understood by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 83.3 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 18:24–7) as moving the disciple to tears, is part of the story in Luke 22:60–2; that Peter wept is also mentioned in Matt 26:75 and Mark 14:72. Neither incident is in this Gospel.

43 The contrast between the Jews' concern for ritual purity and their actual state of defilement is also made here by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 83.3, Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 12 (on 18:28) PG 74 612B–613C, Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 114.2, and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 18:28–32).

44 For a similar statement of Pilate's view of the irregularity of the proceedings, cf Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 83.4. and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 18:28–32). Erasmus had similarly characterized the hearing before the high priest; cf the paraphrase on 18:14.

45 Cf the words of the Roman official Festus in Acts 25:15–16, cited here by Nicholas of Lyra (on 18:29) 237r.

46 Hugh of St Cher (on 18:31) 391r and Nicholas of Lyra (on 18:31) 237v both say here that Pilate recognized that the Jews were handing Jesus over to him out of *invidia*, spiteful envy.

205

47 Hugh of St Cher (on 18:31) 391r similarly paraphrases Pilate's words: 'If you accuse him of a wrong against your law, because he made himself out the Son of God or because he said "I can destroy the temple of God," chapter 2 above, judge him according to your law; because I am not involved in this matter.'

48 According to Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 83.4, followed by Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 18:28–32), the Jews were not forbidden to kill, as the stoning of Stephen proves, but claimed to be forbidden to crucify, which was the particular method by which they wanted Jesus to die.

49 For the rhetorical elaboration here on the theme of the blood guilt of the Jews, cf the similar treatment by Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 114.4.

50 Erasmus understands the prophecy alluded to as that at 12:32, from which his quotation is taken, though Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 114.5, cites Mark 10:33–4 and the reference there to handing over Jesus to the gentiles; while the interlinear *Gloss* and Nicholas of Lyra (on 18:32) 237v cite the parallel passage, Matt 20:19.

51 This reason is also given by Nicholas of Lyra (on 18:33) 237v.

52 Nicholas of Lyra (on 18:33) 237v says here that of the three accusations against Jesus in Luke 23:2, only the third is pursued by Pilate, as bearing on possibly treasonous behaviour; the first is not his concern and the second he knows to be false.

53 Hugh of St Cher (on 18:33) 391r comments here that Pilate was still trying to dismiss the charges and, if possible, set Jesus free. Cf Luke 23:20 and the description of Pilate in the next paragraph.

54 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 83.4 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 18:33–6) say that Jesus' purpose is to reveal the Jews' wickedness by contrast with Pilate's more moderate stance.

206

55 'Armed attendants': *laterones*, intended to be a form of *latrones* in its first meaning of 'armed attendants.' Erasmus would have found *laterones* as part of the explanation of *latrones* in Virgil *Aeneid* 12.7 given by Servius, who cites the etymology of the word by Varro to the effect that '*latrones* are so called as if the word were *laterones* because they are *circa latera* [at the sides] of kings; they are now called *satellites* [guards].' The form is not found elsewhere in standard Latin authors. Erasmus perhaps uses it to make a distinction from the second meaning of *latrones* 'robbers,' 'bandits,' used of Barabbas in the Vulgate of 18:40 and of the two thieves crucified with Jesus in Matt 27:38, Mark 15:27, Luke 23:33 (and by Erasmus in the paraphrase on chapter 19 below).

56 Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 115.1–2 elaborates at some length on the distinction between what Jesus meant and what Pilate and the Jews meant by a kingdom. Nicholas of Lyra (on 18:37) 237v says here: 'Not understanding his words fully, Pilate did grasp from this that he was the king of some kingdom in which the Romans were not involved.'

207

57 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 84.1 and Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 115.5 both note that Pilate does not wait for an answer.

58 Barrabas, not Barabbas or Barrabbas, is the spelling of Erasmus and of the *Gloss* and Nicholas of Lyra (on 18:40) 238r, Hugh of St Cher (on 18:40) 391v, and their Gospel texts.

Chapter 19

1 'Leaving no stone unturned': *nullum non movens lapidem*; with its double negative, this form of the proverb corresponds exactly to its English version, unlike the form in which Erasmus gave it as *Adagia* I iv 30: *Omnem movere lapidem* 'To move every stone' (in CWE 31 340–1 rendered by 'To leave no stone unturned'). In the *Adagia* comment Erasmus cites it from Euripides, the younger Pliny, and Basil, among others.

2 Cf Luke 23:7–12 and the paraphrase on 18:14 n22. Hugh of St Cher (on 19:1) 392r remarks at the outset of his commentary on John 19 that this Evangelist does not include all the events described by the other evangelists, such as the sending of Jesus to Herod in Luke. Erasmus evidently thinks that Pilate sent Jesus to Herod in hopes that Herod would take upon himself the onus of serving as judge in the case.

3 'Towards softening their madness and removing an innocent man from the death penalty' was added in the edition of 1534. The idea, however, was a theme of the paraphrase on 19:1–12 from the first version.

4 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 84.1 says here (and also in 83.1) that the soldiers had been hired by the Jews; cf the paraphrase on 18:14. Chrysostom and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 19:1–7) say that it was the soldiers' own idea to mock Jesus' claim to kingship.

5 The text of 19:2–3 mentions the crown, the purple cloak, the acclamation, and the slaps. Added from the synoptics are the reed sceptre (Matt 27:29) and the kneeling and the spitting (Matt 27:29–30 and Mark 15:19).

6 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 84.1 and Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 116.1 explain Jesus' response to the soldiers' treatment as intended to teach believers patience under similar trials.

7 The observation that Pilate's purpose in allowing Jesus to be beaten and mocked was to assuage the Jews without yielding to their insistence on his execution is made here by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 84.1, Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 12 (on 19:1–3) PG 74 628C, Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 116.1–2, Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 19:1–7), the *Gloss* and Nicholas of Lyra (on 19:1) 238r, and Hugh of St Cher (on 19:4) 392r. Cf n3 above.

208

8 For a similar rhetorical contrast between the expected mollification of the Jews and their actual wild frenzy at the sight of Jesus, cf Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 12 (on 19:5, 6) PG 74 632B.

9 The same expression here in Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 19:1–7)

10 Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 12 (on 19:6) PG 74 633A–C also expands Pilate's remarks in 19:6 into a whole speech, though his treatment centres around what is useful to Pilate rather than what is required by legal justice, as in Erasmus' version.

11 Though none of his usual sources omits to comment here on the statement of 19:8 that Pilate 'was more afraid,' Erasmus drops any reference to Pilate's fear.

209

12 Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 12 (on 19:8, 9) PG 74 637D explains Pilate's question as based on an apprehension that (in a gentile sense) Jesus is the son of a god, 'for the Greek stories call many persons demigods and children of gods.'

13 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 84.2 says that Jesus is silent in order to assert his willingness to die.

14 The Paris theologian Noël Béda objected to the passage from 'to this Jesus' to 'with the Jews' madness' as being impious and wicked; Erasmus replied in the *Elenchus* LB IX 501F–502A and the *Supputatio* LB IX 635F–636A that he is only saying exactly what Jerome in Aquinas' *Catena aurea* (on Matt 27:14 and Mark 15:5) and Chrysostom *Orationes VIII adversus Judaeos* (6.5 PG 48 910) say, that Jesus chose to avoid any show of a defence. In the *Elenchus* Erasmus goes on to suggest that Béda may be imagining some denial of the doctrine of free will because Pilate is described as compelled to comply with the Jews' madness; but, Erasmus says, Béda knows Erasmus' thoughts on the subject of free will. (His defence of the traditional doctrine, *De libero arbitrio*, had appeared in 1524.)

15 Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 12 (on 19:11) PG 74 641A says here that Jesus gave a reply that had to do with Pilate's power in order to remove the impression that he was not dying willingly.

16 The Gospel text of 19:11 says 'he who handed me over to you has the greater sin.' The 'he' is interpreted by Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 12 (on 19:11) PG 74 641D as Judas, the Jewish leaders, and the whole Jewish people; and by Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 116.5 and Hugh of St Cher (on 19:11) 392v as simply Judas. Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 19:8–11) and the interlinear *Gloss* (on 19:11) 238v take it only as the Jewish people.

210

17 'Shouting out': *occlamantes*, not a classical Latin word at all, but found in some obscure medieval texts. Cf eg J.F. Niermeyer and C. van de Kieft *Mediae Latinitatis lexicon minus* (Leiden: E.J. Brill 1976) sv *occlamo*.

18 Erasmus may be thinking of such examples as the many occasions reported by the Roman historian Tacitus on which false accusations brought by political enemies seeking to curry favour with the emperor Tiberius or his successors had resulted in death or exile for prominent Romans. Cf eg *Annals* 1.73–5, 2.27–32, 3.49–51.

19 Cf Matt 27:24.

20 In the annotation on 19:13 (*lichostratus*, the traditional Vulgate spelling) Erasmus corrects, with considerable scorn, the mistakes in Greek and Hebrew made by Nicholas of Lyra and Hugh of St Cher in explaining the words 'Gabbatha' and 'Lithostrotos.' Here also he incorporates the definitions of the names into his paraphrase; 'Gabbatha' means a hill or height, according to Jerome *De nominibus hebraicis* CCL 72 100, while 'Lithostrotos' means 'stone-paved' in Greek.

21 'Innocent blood' is an expression with strong Old Testament associations; cf eg Deut 19:10 and 13, 21:8–9; Ps 94:21.

211

22 Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 12 (on 19:13, 14) PG 74 645B suggests that Pilate has two motives in saying 'Behold, your king': mockery of the Jews' thirst for innocent blood, and reproach for the charge of aspiring to kingship made against one who has suffered as Jesus so clearly has. Erasmus uses both these motives, here and in the earlier sentence beginning 'So Pilate, now visible.'

23 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 85.1, Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 19:14–18), and Nicholas of Lyra (on 19:15) 239r point out the Jews' voluntary rejection of the kingdom of God and acceptance of subjection to Caesar.

24 The Gospel text of 19:15 attributes this declaration to the chief priests.

25 Cf Deut 16:5–6.

26 'Place of the Skull': *calvariae locus*. The interlinear *Gloss* and Nicholas of Lyra (on 19:17) 239r and Hugh of St Cher (on 19:17) 393r say that the site is the regular place of public execution, where criminals were beheaded; Nicholas adds that the nature of the place, as well as the manner of death, makes the shame of Christ's dying evident.

27 Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 12 (on 19:16–18) PG 74 653B, the interlinear *Gloss* and Nicholas of Lyra (on 19:18) 239r point out the Jews' intention to shame Jesus with guilt by association; Nicholas cites Isa 53:12.

28 The conversion of the good thief is added from Luke 23:40–3; the story is introduced here by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 85.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 19:14–18).

29 Erasmus rejects the version of Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 85.1 and Theophylact (on 19:19–22), who say that only Jesus' cross had an inscription.

212

30 This definition of 'Jew' and 'Judas' is given by Jerome *De nominibus hebraicis* CCL 72 67, 136, 152, 155, 157. Erasmus' word for 'confessor' here is *confitens*; in the next sentence 'who profess' is from *profitens*, the same root with a different prefix (and regularly translated in this volume as 'proclaim').

31 See 6:15.

32 The interlinear *Gloss* (on 19:19) 239r comments on 'Pilate wrote an inscription': 'Divine power is working in his heart unawares.' Hugh of St Cher (on 19:19) 393v quotes the comment.

33 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 85.1, quoted by Hugh of St Cher (on 19:17) 393r, says here that the inscription serves as does the one on a military trophy, to proclaim victory and sovereignty.

34 The 'true Jews' are those who profess the name of Christ; cf the paraphrase on 19:19 just above, and n30.

213

35 Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 12 (on 19:23, 24) PG 74 657D notes here that the division of prisoners' garments among the executioners was customary; many of Erasmus' usual sources treat the division as an act of thievery.

36 'Mary, the daughter of Clopas': *Maria Cleophae filia*. That the Gospel text's 'Clopas' Mary' in 19:25 means Mary the daughter (not wife) of Clopas is specifically asserted by Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 19:24–7), the interlinear *Gloss* (on 19:25) 239v, and Hugh of St Cher (on 19:25) 394r.

37 'More intimately than the others': *caeteris familiarius*, almost the same phrase as the explication in the interlinear *Gloss* (on 19:29) 239v, *prae caeteris familiarius*, which is itself a modified quotation from Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 119.1.

38 Cf Nicholas of Lyra (on 19:28) 239v: 'He had suffered so much, and had lost so much blood, that his body was drained and parched, and therefore he was extraordinarily thirsty, and such thirst is a great torment.'

39 Hugh of St Cher (on 19:29) 394r and Nicholas of Lyra (on 19:29) 239v both say that 'some say' the vinegar was kept at hand to hasten the dying of the crucified; Hugh says that Chrysostom (*Hom in Joannem* 85.2) implies that the hyssop was a deliberately poisonous addition. Erasmus' 'sour wine' (*acidum vinum*, not the *acetum* of the Vulgate) may owe something to Hugh's alternative explanation, that the wine was what the soldiers had brought for themselves, cheap to begin with and turned in the heat of the day.

40 'On a stalk of hyssop': *hysopi ligno*; that the hyssop is a stalk, the 'reed' of the synoptics (Matt 27:48, Mark 15:36), is one of two possibilities suggested by Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 19:28–30), the other being that it was a poisonous addition as implied by Chrysostom (see n39). Nicholas of Lyra (on 19:29) 239v also speaks of the *ligno hysopi* 'stalk of hyssop' as the way the sponge was raised to Jesus' lips.

41 Hugh of St Cher (on 19:30) 394r comments on 'when he had taken the vinegar' in the Gospel text: 'that is, when he had tasted it; for he did not take it in the sense of drinking it, as Mark [a mistake for Matthew; cf Matt 27:48] says, but he took it in the sense of tasting it, as it says here.' Nicholas of Lyra (on 19:30) 239v has a similar explanation.

42 Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 12 (on 19:31) PG 74 676B–C comments here that the Evangelist intends to make a strong contrast between the professed piety and the actual criminality of the Jews with respect to the approaching Sabbath. Similarly Erasmus in the person of the Evangelist makes the contrast here explicit.

214

43 'And the sacrosanct Sabbath was almost on them, when it was against divine law to do any work' was added in the 1534 edition.

44 Hugh of St Cher (on 19:31) 394r says that the legs were broken so that the crucified would die more quickly. Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 19:31–4) gives this as one of two possible reasons.

45 'Pierced': *perfodit*. In the annotation on 19:34 (*lancea latus eius aperuit*) Erasmus points out that the Vulgate *aperuit* 'opened' is a misreading of the Greek text as *ἄνοιξε* 'opened' instead of *ἔνυξε* 'pierced.'

46 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 85.2, Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 12 (on 19:32–7) PG 74 677B, Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 19:31–4), and Hugh of St Cher (on 19:34) 394v agree that the water and blood symbolize baptism and the eucharistic nourishment. The water and blood are more generally referred to

the washing away of sins and their remission respectively by Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 120.2, the *Gloss*, and Nicholas of Lyra (on 19:34) 240r. Erasmus here specifies the water as the water of baptism and in the next paragraph speaks of redemption and the Eucharist in connection with the blood ('For the blood of Jesus ...').

47 Hugh of St Cher (on 19:34) 394v and Nicholas of Lyra (on 19:34) 240r say that the miracle here is that it was real water, not just a watery fluid, that flowed from the wound.

48 In the annotation on 19:35 (*et ille scit quia vera dicit*) Erasmus had said that even the Greek of the verse does not make it clear whether the subject of 'and he knows' is Jesus or the Evangelist, since the Evangelist regularly speaks of himself in the third person. All of Erasmus' usual sources either imply or state that the Evangelist is the subject. Erasmus may be reacting to the verbal echo of 5:32, where Jesus says, 'I know that his [the Baptist's] witness is true.'

49 Cf Exod 12:46. The Passover lamb is described here as a foreshadowing or type of the crucified Jesus by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 85.3 and Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 120.3.

50 That the marks of the crucifixion will be visible to all believers and unbelievers when Christ comes in his glorified body is also asserted here by Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 19:35–7), citing Rev 1:7, as one explanation among several by Hugh of St Cher (on 19:37) 394v, and by Nicholas of Lyra (on 19:37) 240r.

215

51 This observation, with reference to the details of the burial given in what follows, is made by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 85.3 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 19:38–42).

52 Cf the paraphrase on 12:7.

53 Cf 9:22.

54 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 85.3 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 19:38–42) say that Joseph was known to Pilate.

55 Added from Mark 15:44–5

56 See 3:2.

57 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 85.3 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 19:38–42) say that Joseph expected the Jews' hostility to have subsided now that Jesus was dead.

58 For the idea that Joseph and Nicodemus are honouring someone they think of only as an extraordinary mortal and that they have no expectation of a resurrection, cf Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 85.3 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 19:38–42).

216

59 'And the Sabbath was imminent' was added in the 1534 edition.

60 'Or be buried with insufficient honour' was added in the 1534 edition.

61 The guards and seals are added from Matt 27:66. Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 85.4 includes reference to them in his discussion of the burial scene and says that they serve as further evidence of the burial.

Chapter 20

1 The visit of a group of women to the tomb is reported at Matt 28:1, Mark 16:1–2, Luke 23:55–24:1. The difference between the version in this Gospel and those of the synoptics is mentioned here by Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 20.1–4), Hugh of St Cher (on 20:1) 395v, and Nicholas of Lyra (on 20:1) 240v.

2 Erasmus here follows the Gospel text of 20:2 used by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 85.4, who reads 'I don't know.' His other usual sources all read 'we don't know,' which is also the text he himself printed in his editions of the New Testament.

3 Erasmus has moved the head-cloth from its place in the description of what Peter saw in the tomb, given in verses 6 and 7 of the Gospel text, to make it part of what the other disciple saw.

217

4 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 85.4 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 20:1–4) also say that thieves would not have had the time to strip the body if they had wanted to, and that the ointments, 'more adhesive than lead,' would have prevented it in any case. Birdlime, a gummy substance prepared from mistletoe berries, was used by the Romans to snare birds: Pliny *Naturalis historia* 16.248, Virgil *Georgics* 1.139, Seneca *De ira* 3.16.1.

5 Erasmus here abandons Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 85.4, Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 12 (on 20:1–11) PG 74 684B, and Hugh of St Cher (on 20:8) 395v, who say that the sight of the empty tomb convinces the male disciples that the resurrection has occurred, and follows instead Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 120.9, Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 20:5–13), and the *Gloss* (on 20:8) 241r in saying that they thought only that the body had been stolen.

6 Cf Luke 24:7 and 45–6, and the version of the prophecy in 2:19–22.

7 'Gentle and glad in appearance' paraphrases the Gospel text's description of the angels as 'in white.' According to Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 86.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 20:5–13) the angels are cheering in their *σχῆμα*, which could mean 'appearance' or 'dress,' and are a sight given to console Mary. Hugh of St Cher (on 20:12) 396r quotes Chrysostom on the interpretation of 'in white,' though he understands only a reference to dress, and Nicholas of Lyra (on 20:12) 241r gives a summary of the same interpretation.

8 Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 121.1 points out that Mary is distraught because, not knowing the location of Jesus' body, she does not know where to go to console her grief.

218

9 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 86.1, followed by Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 20:14–18) and Hugh of St Cher (on 20:14) 396r, says that Mary saw a change in the angels' faces and gestures, and so knew that someone was behind her; Chrysostom adds that Jesus appeared to the angels in this moment in his resurrected glory, but to Mary only in a common human form, to avoid frightening her.

10 'Sir': *domine*. On this word, cf the paraphrase on 4:11 and n21, and the paraphrase on 9:36 and n43. Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 121.2 and the *Gloss* (on

20:15) 241r comment here on the courtesy title *domine* addressed to a person from whom Mary is asking a favour.

11 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 86.1 suggests that Mary believes the gardener and others have moved the body out of fear of the Jews.

12 The addition (from Jerome) of 'in Syrian' to the definition of 'rabbi' was also given at the paraphrase on 1:38; cf n126 there.

13 Mary's attempt to kiss Jesus' feet is reported only by Matt 28:9. Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 86.2, followed by Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 20:14–18), remarks here that Mary apparently tries to touch him, that is, to resume their earlier familiarity; the *Gloss* (on 20:17) 241r says that the command 'Do not touch me' implies that Mary tried to embrace Jesus' feet. Hugh of St Cher (on 20:17) 396r and Nicholas of Lyra (on 20:17) 241r–v make the same connection between this episode and the Matthew passage.

14 [us]: the verb here lacks an object in the Latin text.

15 Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 12 (on 20:17) PG 74 692D–696D says that Mary is not to touch Jesus because she and the others have not yet received the Spirit promised in 16:7. For the Spirit as comforter in the *Paraphrase on John*, cf the paraphrase on 14:16 and n20 there, and the references to the Spirit *passim* in chapters 14–17.

16 As Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 86.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 20:14–18) point out here, while the Gospel text of 20:17 says 'I am ascending to my Father,' in fact the ascension was forty days later. Erasmus accommodates this passage to such earlier passages as 16:16–22.

219

17 'Some other appearances' are those reported in the synoptics, Matt 28:9–10, Mark 16:12–14, Luke 24:13–32. Hugh of St Cher (on 20:19) 396v gives a list of five occasions on which Jesus appeared on the day of the resurrection.

18 Nicholas of Lyra (on 20:19) 241v says here, explaining the Gospel text's *una sabbatorum* 'Sabbath one,' 'that is, the first day after the Sabbath.'

19 Alluding to 16:16–22, quoted here by Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 12 (on 20:20) PG 74 708A

20 Alluding to 14:27 and 16:33

21 Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 121.4 says here: 'The repetition [of 'peace to you'] is strengthening.'

22 In discussing the meaning of the gift of the Holy Spirit here as contrasted with the Pentecost gift reported at Acts 2:1–4, Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 86.3 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 20:19–23) say that the gift confers the authority needed for the disciples to carry on Jesus' work. Hugh of St Cher (on 20:21) 397r and Nicholas of Lyra (on 20:21) 241v specify that the work is preaching. Cf Luke 24:47.

23 For Erasmus' presentation in the *Paraphrase on John* of harmony among Christians, particularly preachers, cf the paraphrases on 14:27 and 17:23. In the annotation on 20:21 (*dixit ergo eis iterum, pax vobis*) Erasmus comments on the absence of peace among Christians, as shown by the wars among them. He says there that the peace of Christ ought especially to be recalled by contemporary clergy, who are more interested in the authority to remit and retain sins than in the Spirit in which it is to be done.

24 For Erasmus' amplification here, that the bestowal of power to remit and

retain sins refers to believers and non-believers respectively, cf Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 121.4, who says 'The church's love ... remits the sins of its members, but retains the sins of those who are not members.'

25 'Twin': *geminus*

220

26 Hugh of St Cher (on 20:24) 397r, followed by Nicholas of Lyra (on 20:24) 241v, here cites and summarizes Gregory the Great (*XL Homilia in evangelia* 26 PL 76 1201C–D), all of them saying in more or less the same terms that Thomas' doubt was provided by divine dispensation and ordinance to confirm our faith. Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 12 (on 20:29) PG 74 736A–D has a comment to the same effect.

27 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 87.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 20:24–9) remark that Jesus reveals his divine omniscience by knowing Thomas' doubt without waiting to be told of it.

28 The affirmation in Thomas' words of Jesus as both God and man is emphasized here by Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 121.4, Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 20:24–9), Hugh of St Cher (on 20:28) 397v, and Nicholas of Lyra (on 20:28) 242r. In the annotation on 20:28 (*dominus meus et deus meus*) Erasmus says that this is the one place where the Evangelist openly calls Christ God, though there are many places in the New Testament where his divinity can be deduced. Cf the preface to the *Paraphrase* in chapter 1, 14 and n8.

29 'You believe': *credis*, present tense, for the Vulgate perfect *credidisti* 'you have believed'; Erasmus apparently prefers the present perfective sense of the corresponding Greek perfect.

30 The paraphrase casts into future tense a sentence (20:29b) which in Greek lacks an unambiguous time reference and in the Vulgate contains two definitely past tense verbs, 'have seen' and 'have believed.' Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 121.4 says of these two verbs that they are past tense instead of future because their speaker, knowing the truth of his statement in predestination, treats it as having already happened.

31 Though Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 87.1–2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 20:30, 31) understand the reference in 20:30 to be only to post-resurrection miracles, the *Gloss* (on 20:30) 242r regards this afterword as referring to both pre- and post-resurrection miracles. For the writings of the other evangelists, cf the preface to the *Paraphrase* in chapter 1, 14.

32 Cf 21:25.

33 Nicholas of Lyra (on 20:31) 242r says here: 'As was said at the beginning, John's main purpose in this Gospel is to declare the divinity of Christ and his eternal generation from the Father.' Cf the preface to the *Paraphrase* in chapter 1, 15.

Chapter 21

221

1 Cf Luke 24:13–49, Acts 1:3–4. Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 12 (on 20:29) PG 74

736A–D comments that besides his reassurance of Thomas, Jesus had given all the disciples evidence that he was not a ghost by eating with them. Erasmus had similarly explained Lazarus' attendance at a banquet in the paraphrase on 12:2.

2 Cf 14:19–22. Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 87.2 also remarks that Jesus appears only to his disciples and only occasionally, and that his body, now immortal, is glorious and awe-inspiring.

3 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 87.2 makes the same observation.

4 Alluding to 2:1–11

5 The names are given here by the interlinear *Gloss* (on 21:2) 242v and Hugh of St Cher (on 21:2) 398r.

6 Cf 1 Cor 9:14. Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 122.2–3 says that the disciples go fishing again to supply their needs, and that they do so without harm to their mission, as Paul did later on; Augustine quotes 1 Cor 9:11–15, 1 Cor 15:10, and 2 Thess 3:8.

7 This is Chrysostom's explanation, *Hom in Joannem* 87.2.

222

8 That Jesus addressed them as if wanting to buy fish is the explanation of Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 87.2, followed by Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 21:1–8).

9 Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 122.7–9 and 123.2, and Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 12 (on 21:1–7) PG 74 744D see the catch of fish as symbolizing the numbers of the faithful who would be drawn to Jesus by the apostles' preaching.

10 'His shirt': *interula* 'inner garment.' Yet Erasmus had pointed out in the annotation on 21:7 (*tunica succinxit se*) that the Greek word translated in the Vulgate by *tunica* meant an overgarment, not an undergarment, though *tunica* itself usually means an inner garment.

11 'A loaf of bread as well': *praeterea panem*. Erasmus' construction of the phrase so that the bread is understood not to be on the fire with the fish is paralleled in Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 123.2, who carefully explains that the bread is nearby, not on the fire.

12 That the wording of 21:11 refers to both the number and the size of the fish is the interpretation of the interlinear *Gloss* (on 21:11) 243r and Hugh of St Cher (on 21:11) 398v. But in the annotation on 21:11 (*et cum tanti*) Erasmus had specifically said that the Greek *τοσούτων ὄντων* meant number only, not size.

13 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 87.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 21:9–14) point out that the Evangelist does not actually say here that Jesus himself ate, but that we may conclude that he did from Luke's words in Acts 1:4.

14 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 87.2 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 21:9–14) explain the disciples' silence as due to their awe of the appearance of his resurrected body.

223

15 For this eucharistic interpretation of the meal, and the concomitant interpretation of the Eucharist, see the paraphrase on 6:11–13 and the notes there. Cf also Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 87.2, who draws some parallels with the episode in 6:1–13, but not the specific interpretation found here.

16 'Asking': *stipulatus*. Erasmus uses a term from Roman law, where it is used of exacting a legally binding promise by formal question and answer.

17 For the counterbalancing of Peter's denial (at 18:16–27) with the triple affirmation of his love, and his primacy over the others as pastor of the Lord's flock, cf Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 88.1, Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 12 (on 21:15–17) PG 74 749A–B, Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 123.3–5, and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 21:15–19).

18 'Mouthpiece': *os*. The same metaphor is used of Peter here by Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 88.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 21:15–19).

19 Alluding to Matt 16:16–19

20 The Gospel text of 21:15 is ambiguous: 'Do you love me more than these?' There is no indication in the syntax in Greek or Latin whether this means 'more than these do' or 'more than you love these.' Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 124.4, followed by the *Gloss* and Nicholas of Lyra (on 21:15) 243r, takes it as Erasmus does. Hugh of St Cher (on 21:15) 398v gives both possibilities without deciding between them.

21 The explanation of the caution in Peter's response and refusal to answer for the others follows Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 124.4.

22 As readers of the Greek and Vulgate texts knew, those texts each use one verb for 'love' in the first two questions and another in the third. Erasmus also varies his verbs, saying *diligis* for the first question and *amas* for the next two. In the annotation on 21:15 (*tu scis quia amo te*) Erasmus reports the view of Augustine *De civitate Dei* 14 (14.7) that there is no significant difference in the variation. Augustine says the same thing in *Tract in Joannem* 123.5.

224

23 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 88.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 21:15–19) emphasize here Peter's distrust of himself, based on his earlier impetuosity and its results.

24 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 88.1 and Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 123.5 both cite here the ultimate act of the good shepherd, laying down his life for the flock, as at 10:11.

25 'Skin': *deglubere*, a rare Latin word from the vocabulary of husbandry and perhaps brought to Erasmus' mind in this context by the remark of the emperor Tiberius made in reply to an overzealous tax officer: *Boni pastoris esse tondere pecus, non deglubere* 'It is the mark of a good shepherd to shear the sheep, not skin them' (Suetonius *Tiberius* 32.2).

26 Cf 10:10–13 and the paraphrase on that passage.

27 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 88.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 21:15–19) remark here that in reversal of the biological rule, spiritual strength comes in old age.

225

28 Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem* 88.1, Cyril *Comm in Joannem* 12 (on 21:18, 19) PG 74 752D, Augustine *Tract in Joannem* 123.5, and Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* (on 21:15–19) all see a reference here not only to martyrdom but to crucifixion; Augustine further remarks on the emotional conflict between Peter's natural fear of dying and his spiritual love for his Lord.

29 Nicholas of Lyra (on 21:21) 243v says that Peter's affection for John made him want to have the other as a companion in his pastorate and martyrdom.

30 'If I were to want this one to wait': *si hunc velim manere*. Erasmus' paraphrase here represents the Greek more vivid future condition ('if I want') in 21:22 by a Latin future less vivid condition ('if I were to want'). The Vulgate translation, in contrast, has an affirmative statement, *sic eum volo manere* 'I want him to remain this way.' As Erasmus pointed out in the annotation on 21:22 (*sic eum volo manere*), the Latin *sic* 'thus,' 'this way' is most likely a scribal error for *si* 'if.'

31 Nicholas of Lyra (on 21:24) 244r, commenting on 'who bears witness about these things,' says 'supply "which he saw and heard,"' and cites 1 John 1:1.

32 Cf 20:30–1 and the preface to this *Paraphrase* in chapter 1, 15.

33 Cf 20:31.

To the Pious Reader

226

1 This afterword addressed to the pious reader was first added to the *Paraphrase on John* in 1524, in some Basel editions but not in others; cf the forthcoming ASD edition of the *Paraphrases in quatuor evangelia*, edited by Irena Backus. A June 1524 copy in the collection of the Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, Victoria University in the University of Toronto, includes it; see Erika Rummel, 'Erasmus' New Testament Scholarship: Originals and Facsimiles' *Erasmus in English* 15 (1987–8) 25–6. Erasmus explains the reason for the addition in the closing sentence. It was included in Froben's 1534 octavo, but not in the Froben 1535 folio.

2 This sentence was censured by a committee of Spanish monks; Erasmus replied to their criticism in the 1528 *Apologia adversus monachos* LB IX 1082D–1083C. He does not understand, he says, why they found the sentence objectionable, unless they thought it implied that faith alone was all that is required for salvation; but if they had read the previous sentence they would have seen that purity of life is also a requirement.

3 For dove-like eyes cf Song of Sol 5:12. For the dove as a figure of simplicity cf Matt 10:16. For the eye(s) of the mind, a frequent image in Erasmus, cf the preface to this *Paraphrase* in chapter 1, 13 and n3.

4 In the *Ratio* and in the letter to Paul Volz, Ep 858, Erasmus had made use of another image of circles or spheres to explain the relation between God and the world, but in that one the Christian community is represented by three concentric bands of the three human estates, clergy, princes, and commoners, with Christ as their centre-point. The image is discussed at length by Marjorie O'Rourke Boyle *Erasmus on Language and Method in Theology* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press 1977) 84–91. The present image is not as elaborate or as clearly laid out. Note, for instance, that while the heavenly sphere has no centre-point, the earthly one does; yet the two are said both to 'intersect' and to be 'tangled together in many ways.'

5 'Triad': *ternio*, a rare Latin word for the number three; Erasmus' application of it to the Trinity is apparently an innovation. See the next note.

227

6 'Triad ... tyrant': *ternionem ... tyrannus*. The chance to make a punning comparison between *ternio* and *tyrannus*, with their identical sequences of consonants, may have directed Erasmus' choice of *ternio* for 'Trinity' in this afterword. Cf other puns in the paraphrase on 6:14 and n23, and on 8:33 and n54.

7 Erasmus alludes here, as often elsewhere, to the widespread belief in the spiritual superiority of monastic life; cf eg the colloquies *Exequiae seraphicae* 'The Seraphic Funeral' and *Virgo μισόγαμος* 'The Girl with No Interest in Marriage,' and Ep 858:481–3, where he says, 'I have no wish to upbraid the Franciscans for being devoted to their own rule and the Benedictines for devotion to theirs; I object that some of them think their rule more important than the gospel.'

228

8 'Memorial services': *parentalia*, a strikingly pagan word, meaning the memorial offerings made annually at the tombs of their ancestors by pious Romans, and intended to appease the baleful spirits of the dead. Cf Ovid *Fasti* 2.533–70.

9 'St Peter's threshold': ie Rome. Compostela is the famous shrine of St James in Spain.

10 For examples of Erasmus' mockery of this superstition cf the colloquies *Funus* 'The Funeral' and *Exequiae seraphicae* 'The Seraphic Funeral.'

THE SEQUENCE AND DATES OF THE PUBLICATION OF THE PARAPHRASES

WORKS FREQUENTLY CITED

SHORT-TITLE FORMS FOR ERASMUS' WORKS

INDEX OF SCRIPTURAL PASSAGES CITED

INDEX OF GREEK AND LATIN WORDS CITED

GENERAL INDEX

The indexes refer primarily to the editor's preface, the translator's note, the dedicatory letter, and the notes. An index of all the names and theological terms in the paraphrase itself is beyond the scope of this volume.

THE SEQUENCE AND DATES OF THE PUBLICATION OF THE PARAPHRASES

The Epistles

Romans	November 1517
Corinthians 1 and 2	February 1519
Galatians	May 1519
Timothy 1 and 2, Titus, Philemon	November/December 1519
Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, and Thessalonians 1 and 2	January/February 1520
Peter 1 and 2, Jude	June/July 1520
James	December 1520
John 1–3, Hebrews	January 1521

Gospels and Acts

Matthew	March 1522
John	February 1523
Luke	August 1523
Mark	December 1523/February 1524
Acts	February 1524

The Epistles were originally published by Dirk Martens in Louvain, except for Timothy, Titus, and Philemon published by Michaël Hillen in Antwerp. The Gospels and Acts were all originally published by Johann Froben in Basel.

WORKS FREQUENTLY CITED

This list provides bibliographical information for publications referred to in short-title form in introductions and notes. For Erasmus' writings see the short-title list following.

ASD	*Opera omnia Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami* (Amsterdam 1969–)
Augustine *Tract in Joannem*	*In Iohannis evangelium tractatus CXXIV* CCL 36
Brown AB *John*	Raymond E. Brown ed and trans *The Gospel according to John* Anchor Bible vols 29–29A (Garden City, NY 1966–70)
Catena aurea	Thomas Aquinas *Catena aurea in quatuor evangelia* ed A. Guarienti (Turin 1953) 2 vols
CCL	*Corpus christianorum, series latina* (Turnhout 1953–)
Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem*	John Chrysostom *In sanctum Joannem apostolum et evangelistam homiliae LXXXVIII* PG 59
CWE	Collected Works of Erasmus (Toronto 1974–)
Cyril *Comm in Joannem*	Cyril of Alexandria *Commentarium in evangelium Joannis* PG 73
ERSY	*Erasmus of Rotterdam Society Yearbook*
Gloss	*Glossa ordinaria,* in *Biblia sacra* (Lyon 1545) V
Hugh of St Cher	Hugo de Sancto Charo *In evangelia ... opus ... in quo declarantur sensus omnes* (Venice 1732) VI
LB	J. Leclerc ed *Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami opera omnia* (Leiden 1703–6) 10 vols
Nestle-Aland 26th ed	*Novum testamentum Graece et Latine.* Textum Graecum post Eberhard Nestle et Erwin Nestle communiter ediderunt Kurt Aland, Matthew Black, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce Metzger, Allen Wikgren; Textus Latinus Novae Vulgatae Bibliorum Sacrorum Editioni debetur; utriusque textus apparatum criticum recensuerunt et editionem novis curis elaboraverunt Kurt Aland et Barbara Aland una cum Institutio studiorum textus Novi Testamenti Monasteriensi (Westphalia) (Stuttgart 1984)
Nicholas of Lyra	Nicolaus Lyranus *Postilla* (Lyon 1545) V

OCD	*The Oxford Classical Dictionary* ed N.G.L. Hammond and H.H. Scullard, 2nd ed (Oxford 1970)
Opuscula	W.K. Ferguson ed *Erasmi opuscula: A Supplement to the Opera omnia* (The Hague 1933)
Payne *Theology of the Sacraments*	John B. Payne *Erasmus: His Theology of the Sacraments* (Richmond 1970)
PG	J.-P. Migne ed *Patrologiae cursus completus ... series graeca* (Paris 1857–86) 162 vols
PL	J.-P. Migne ed *Patrologiae cursus completus ... series latina* (Paris 1844–66) 221 vols
Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem*	Theophylact of Bulgaria *Enarratio in evangelium Joannis* PG 123–4
Thompson *Colloquies*	Craig R. Thompson ed and trans *The Colloquies of Erasmus* (Chicago and London 1965)
Valla *Annotationes*	Laurentius Valla *Opera omnia* I ed E. Garin (Turin 1962)

SHORT-TITLE FORMS FOR ERASMUS' WORKS

Titles following colons are longer versions of the same, or are alternative titles. Items entirely enclosed in square brackets are of doubtful authorship. For abbreviations, see Works Frequently Cited.

Adagia: Adagiorum chiliades 1508, etc (Adagiorum collectanea for the primitive form, when required) LB II / ASD II-4, 5, 6 / CWE 30–6
Admonitio adversus mendacium: Admonitio adversus mendacium et obtrectationem LB X
Annotationes in Novum Testamentum LB VI
Antibarbari LB X / ASD I-1 / CWE 23
Apologia ad Caranzam: Apologia ad Sanctium Caranzam, or Apologia de tribus locis, or Responsio ad annotationem Stunicae ... a Sanctio Caranza defensam LB IX
Apologia ad Fabrum: Apologia ad Iacobum Fabrum Stapulensem LB IX
Apologia adversus monachos: Apologia adversus monachos quosdam hispanos LB IX
Apologia adversus Petrum Sutorem: Apologia adversus debacchationes Petri Sutoris LB IX
Apologia adversus rhapsodias Alberti Pii: Apologia ad viginti et quattuor libros A. Pii LB IX
Apologia contra Latomi dialogum: Apologia contra Iacobi Latomi dialogum de tribus linguis LB IX
Apologiae contra Stunicam: Apologiae contra Lopidem Stunicam LB IX / ASD IX-2
Apologia de 'In principio erat sermo' LB IX
Apologia de laude matrimonii: Apologia pro declamatione de laude matrimonii LB IX
Apologia de loco 'Omnes quidem': Apologia de loco 'Omnes quidem resurgemus' LB IX
Apologia invectivis Lei: Apologia qua respondet duabus invectivis Eduardi Lei *Opuscula*
Apophthegmata LB IV
Appendix respondens ad Sutorem LB IX
Argumenta: Argumenta in omnes epistolas apostolicas nova (with Paraphrases)
Axiomata pro causa Lutheri: Axiomata pro causa Martini Lutheri *Opuscula*

Carmina varia LB VIII
Catalogus lucubrationum LB I
Christiani hominis institutum, carmen LB V
Ciceronianus: Dialogus Ciceronianus LB I / ASD I-2 / CWE 28
Colloquia LB I / ASD I-3
Compendium vitae Allen I / CWE 4
[Consilium: Consilium cuiusdam ex animo cupientis esse consultum] *Opuscula*

De bello turcico: Consultatio de bello turcico (in Psalmi)
De civilitate: De civilitate morum puerilium LB I / CWE 25
Declamatio de morte LB IV

Declamatiuncula lb iv
Declarationes ad censuras Lutetiae vulgatas: Declarationes ad censuras Lutetiae vulgatas sub nomine facultatis theologiae Parisiensis lb ix
De concordia: De sarcienda ecclesiae concordia, or De amabili ecclesiae concordia (in Psalmi)
De conscribendis epistolis lb i / asd i-2 / cwe 25
De constructione: De constructione octo partium orationis, or Syntaxis lb i / asd i-4
De contemptu mundi: Epistola de contemptu mundi lb v / asd v-1 / cwe 66
De copia: De duplici copia verborum ac rerum lb i / asd i-6 / cwe 24
De immensa Dei misericordia: Concio de immensa Dei misericordia lb v
De libero arbitrio: De libero arbitrio diatribe lb ix
De praeparatione: De praeparatione ad mortem lb v / asd v-1
De pueris instituendis: De pueris statim ac liberaliter instituendis lb i / asd i-2 / cwe 26
De puero Iesu: Concio de puero Iesu lb v / cwe 29
De puritate tabernaculi: De puritate tabernaculi sive ecclesiae christianae (in Psalmi)
De ratione studii lb i / asd i-2 / cwe 24
De recta pronuntiatione: De recta latini graecique sermonis pronuntiatione lb i / asd i-4 / cwe 26
Detectio praestigiarum: Detectio praestigiarum cuiusdam libelli germanice scripti lb x / asd ix-1
De taedio Iesu: Disputatiuncula de taedio, pavore, tristicia Iesu lb v
De vidua christiana lb v / cwe 66
De virtute amplectenda: Oratio de virtute amplectenda lb v / cwe 29
[Dialogus bilinguium ac trilinguium: Chonradi Nastadiensis dialogus bilinguium ac trilinguium] *Opuscula* / cwe 7
Dilutio: Dilutio eorum quae Iodocus Clithoveus scripsit adversus declamationem suasoriam matrimonii
Divinationes ad notata Bedae lb ix

Ecclesiastes: Ecclesiastes sive de ratione concionandi lb v
Elenchus in N. Bedae censuras lb ix
Enchiridion: Enchiridion militis christiani lb v / cwe 66
Encomium matrimonii (in De conscribendis epistolis)
Encomium medicinae: Declamatio in laudem artis medicae lb i / asd i-4 / cwe 29
Epigrammata lb i
Epistola ad Dorpium lb ix / cwe 3
Epistola ad fratres Inferioris Germaniae: Responsio ad fratres Germaniae Inferioris ad epistolam apologeticam incerto autore proditam lb x / asd ix-1
Epistola ad graculos: Epistola ad quosdam imprudentissimos graculos lb x
Epistola apologetica de Termino lb x
Epistola consolatoria: Epistola consolatoria virginibus sacris lb v
Epistola contra pseudevangelicos: Epistola contra quosdam qui se falso iactant evangelicos lb x / asd ix-1
Epistola de esu carnium: Epistola apologetica ad Christophorum episcopum Basiliensem de interdicto esu carnium lb ix / asd ix-1
Exomologesis: Exomologesis sive modus confitendi lb v
Explanatio symboli: Explanatio symboli apostolorum sive catechismus lb v / asd v-1

Expositio concionalis (in Psalmi)
Expostulatio Iesu LB V

Formula: Conficiendarum epistolarum formula (see De conscribendis epistolis)

Hymni varii LB V
Hyperaspistes LB X

In Nucem Ovidiii commentarius LB I / ASD I-1 / CWE 29
In Prudentium: Commentarius in duos hymnos Prudentii LB V / CWE 29
Institutio christiani matrimonii LB V
Institutio principis christiani LB IV / ASD IV-1 / CWE 27

[Julius exclusus: Dialogus Julius exclusus e coelis] *Opuscula* / CWE 27

Lingua LB IV / ASD IV-1A / CWE 29
Liturgia Virginis Matris: Virginis Matris apud Lauretum cultae liturgia LB V / ASD V-1

Methodus (see Ratio)
Modus orandi Deum LB V / ASD V-1
Moria: Moriae encomium LB IV / ASD IV-3 / CWE 27

Novum Testamentum: Novum Testamentum 1519 and later (Novum instrumentum for the first edition, 1516, when required) LB VI

Obsecratio ad Virginem Mariam: Obsecratio sive oratio ad Virginem Mariam in rebus adversis LB V
Oratio de pace: Oratio de pace et discordia LB VIII
Oratio funebris: Oratio funebris Berthae de Heyen LB VIII / CWE 29

Paean Virgini Matri: Paean Virgini Matri dicendus LB V
Panegyricus: Panegyricus ad Philippum Austriae ducem LB IV / ASD IV-1 / CWE 27
Parabolae: Parabolae sive similia LB I / ASD I-5 / CWE 23
Paraclesis LB V, VI
Paraphrasis in Elegantias Vallae: Paraphrasis in Elegantias Laurentii Vallae LB I / ASD I-4
Paraphrasis in Matthaeum, etc (in Paraphrasis in Novum Testamentum)
Paraphrasis in Novum Testamentum LB VII / CWE 42–50
Peregrinatio apostolorum: Peregrinatio apostolorum Petri et Pauli LB VI, VII
Precatio ad Virginis filium Iesum LB V
Precatio dominica LB V
Precationes LB V
Precatio pro pace ecclesiae: Precatio ad Iesum pro pace ecclesiae LB IV, V
Progymnasmata: Progymnasmata quaedam primae adolescentiae Erasmi LB VIII
Psalmi: Psalmi, or Enarrationes sive commentarii in psalmos LB V / ASD V-2, 3
Purgatio adversus epistolam Lutheri: Purgatio adversus epistolam non sobriam Lutheri LB IX / ASD IX-1

Querela pacis LB IV / ASD IV-2 / CWE 27

Ratio: Ratio seu Methodus compendio perveniendi ad veram theologiam (Methodus for the shorter version originally published in the Novum instrumentum of 1516) LB V, VI
Responsio ad annotationes Lei: Liber quo respondet annotationibus Lei LB IX
Responsio ad collationes: Responsio ad collationes cuiusdam iuvenis gerontodidascali LB IX
Responsio ad disputationem de divortio: Responsio ad disputationem cuiusdam Phimostomi de divortio LB IX
Responsio ad epistolam Pii: Responsio ad espistolam paraeneticam Alberti Pii, or Responsio ad exhortationem Pii LB IX
Responsio ad notulas Bedaicas LB X
Responsio ad Petri Cursii defensionem: Epistola de apologia Cursii LB X
Responsio adversus febricitantis libellum: Apologia monasticae religionis LB X

Spongia: Spongia adversus aspergines Hutteni LB X / ASD IX-1
Supputatio: Supputatio calumniarum Natalis Bedae LB IX

Tyrannicida: Tyrannicida, declamatio Lucianicae respondens LB I / CWE 29

Virginis et martyris comparatio LB V
Vita Hieronymi: Vita divi Hieronymi Stridonensis *Opuscula*

Index of Scriptural Passages Cited

Genesis
1:1 112 n42
1:26 58 n45
2:7 122 n11
3:7 36 n154
15:6 116 n64
22 115 n59
34 54 n6
49:10 58 n45

Exodus
3:14 112 n41, 120 n79
4:10 82 n44
4:22 116 n65
12:1–28 30 n113
12:46 214 n49
14:31 82 n44
19:17–19 72 n44
20:5 121 n5, 121 n6
20:13 95 n21
20:18–19 74 n56
23:3 97 n31
23:7 95 n21
32 20 n57
34:7 121 n6

Leviticus
19:15 97 n31
19:18 73 n54
20:10 105 n5

Numbers
18:8–24 110 n36

Deuteronomy
1:17 97 n31
5:9 121 n5, 121 n6
5:17 95 n21
6:4 137 n44
6:5 73 n49
16:5–6 211 n25
18:15–18 27 n102, 35 n147
18:15 58 n45, 78 n22
18:16–22 74 n56
19:10 210 n21
19:13 210 n21
21:8–9 210 n21
22:22 105 n5
24:16 121 n5
27:1–12 57 n32

1 Kings
16:24ff 53 n4
16:32–3 57 n33
17:17–24 43 n40, 146 n47
18:21 45 n10

2 Kings
2:11 27 n100
4:18–37 43 n40
14:6 121 n5
17 53 n4
17:10–11 57 n33
17:26–41 57 n36

2 Chronicles
1:10 10 n21

Esther
1:1 148 n56
7:2 38 n4
8:9 148 n56

Job
3 65 n10
15:26 163 n21

Psalms
7:9 36 n155
7:14–16 102 n56
8:5–8 16 n23
8:8 82 n47
23:5 40 n22
35:19 182 n17
36:8 40 n22
41:9 163 n22, 194 n17
43:3 49 n39
50:8–15 57 n39
69:4 182 n17
69:21 213
78:24 82 n45
82:6 25 n91, 37 n158
94:21 210 n21
109 194 n17
110:1 23 n72
110:4 34 n136, 156
132:17 19 n42

Proverbs
3:28 33 n128
27:2 108 n28

Song of Solomon
5:1 40 n22
5:12 226 n3

Isaiah
1:11–20 57 n39
6:9–10 21 n59
6:9 157
7:9 53 n4
8:6 123 n15
9:1–2 35 n143
9:1 41 n28
9:7 156
35:5–6 135 n30
40:3–5 19 n42
40:3 19 n42, 24 n84, 28 n103
40:9 151 n19
40:18 13 n2
42:3 45 n3
43:10 13 n6
46:5 13 n2
53:4–8 30 n116
53:7 30 n113, 149 n1
53:8 97 n36
53:12 211 n27
60:1–2 19 n48

Jeremiah
2:27 20 n57
7:4 73 n53
9:26 96 n29
11:19 149 n1
12:3 149 n1
31:30 121 n5
31:33 114 n54
51:40 149 n1

Ezekiel
16:44 46 n16
18:2–4 121 n5
18:23 107 n20
18:32 107 n20, 162 n18
33:11 107 n20
34 129 n1

Daniel
7:14 156

Hosea
6:6 57 n39

Amos
5:21–2 92 n11

Micah
5:2 36 n149, 97 n34,
97 n36, 156

Zechariah
9:9 151 n19
9:15 40 n22

Malachi
3:1 19 n41, 19 n42
4:5–6 27 n100
4:5 78 n22

Wisdom
9 10 n22

Sirach
13:15 180 n13
27:9 180 n13
48:1 18 n37
50:25–6 53 n4

1 Maccabees
5:15 41 n28

Matthew
2:1–3 24 n82
2:19–20 38 n159
2:23 36 n148
3:1–2 19 n43
3:2 24 n83, 31 n118
3:3 19 n42
3:5–6 24 n85, 29 n110
3:11 45 n9
3:13–17 23 n75
3:14 30 n117, 31 n119, 160 n11
4:11 38 n159
4:13–15 41 n28
4:13 78 n25
4:15–16 35 n143
5:10–11 127 n41
5:11–12 184 n6
5:14 20 n49
5:17 105 n10
5:39–45 172 n30
6:12 106 n13
6:14–15 106 n13
8:9 179 n10
8:30–2 130 n11
9:18–26 43 n40, 70 n32
9:24 141 n11
9:32–4 169 n9
10:3 173 n32
10:16 34 n137, 226 n3
10:38 172 n30
11:11 19 n41
11:12 60 n56
11:14 27 n101
11:23 41 n28
11:25 47 n24
11:27 13 n4
12:5 96 n27
12:8 67 n22
12:11–12 67 n20
12:20 45 n3
12:24 198 n27
12:33 166 n41
12:39–41 43 n36
12:46–50 39 n9
13:1–23 49 n34
13:4 82 n47
13:13–15 84 n60
13:14–15 21 n59
13:24–30 15 n10
13:55 84 n58, 94 n17
13:57 62 n66
14:19 77 n14, 77 n15
14:24–32 79 n29
14:26 79 n30
14:28–31 167 n45
14:32 79 n31
15:14 108 n25
15:36 77 n14, 77 n15
16:4 43 n36
16:6–12 101 n53
16:14 27 n102
16:16–19 223 n19
16:17 35 n139
16:18–19 37 n157
16:18 35 n141
16:19 34 n133
16:21 199 n9
16:22–3 167 n45, 200 n17
16:23 164 n27
16:24 172 n30
16:27 38 n160
17:1–8 23 n74
17:10–13 27 n101
17:17–20 166 n41
18:21–35 106 n13
20:19 205 n50
20:26–7 162 n19
21:5 151 n19

21:12–13 41 n31
21:37 181 n14
22:37 73 n49
23:6 45 n2
23:16 108 n25
23:24 108 n25
23:37 148 n59
23:39 151 n17
25:14–30 6 n17
25:31–3 130 n6, 130 n11
26:6–13 139 n1, 149 n6
26:8 150 n9
26:26–30 160 n5
26:38 154 n33
26:41 46 n17
26:48–9 199 n6
26:64 23 n72
26:75 204 n42
27:24 210 n19
27:29–30 207 n5
27:29 207 n5
27:38 206 n55
27:45–53 23 n78
27:48 213 n40, 213 n41
27:54 23 n79
27:66 216 n61
28:1 216 n1
28:2–7 38 n159
28:9–10 219 n17
28:9 186 n15, 218 n13
28:16–20 186 n15

Mark
1:2–3 19 n42
1:2 19 n41
1:3 28 n104
1:5 24 n85, 29 n110
1:7 71 n40
1:9–11 23 n75
2:1 78 n25
2:27 67 n19
2:28 67 n22
3:18 173 n32
3:22 198 n27
3:31–5 39 n9
4:1–20 49 n34
4:30 13 n2
5:11–14 130 n11
5:21–43 70 n32
5:22–43 43 n40
6:4 62 n66
6:41 77 n14, 77 n15
6:48–51 79 n29
6:49 79 n30
6:51 79 n31
7:3–4 114 n52
7:25–30 169 n9
8:6 77 n14, 77 n15
8:15 101 n53
8:18 84 n60
8:28 27 n102
8:31 199 n9
8:32–3 167 n45
8:33 164 n27, 200 n17
8:34 172 n30
8:38 38 n160, 45 n11
9:2–8 23 n74
10:33–4 205 n50
11:15–17 41 n31
12:6 181 n14
12:30 73 n49
13:21–2 131 n22
14:3–9 139 n1, 149 n6
14:4 150 n9
14:22–6 160 n5
14:44–5 199 n6
14:62 23 n72
14:72 204 n42
15:19 207 n5
15:27 206 n55
15:33–8 23 n78
15:36 213 n40
15:39 23 n79
15:44–5 215 n55
16:1–2 216 n1
16:5–7 38 n159
16:9–20 186 n15
16:12–14 219 n17

Luke
1:1–4 13 n1
1:26–38 38 n159
2:8–20 24 n82
2:9–15 38 n159
2:25–38 24 n82
2:41–51 24 n82, 38 n5, 39 n8

2:51 36 n148
3:4–6 19 n42
3:4 28 n104
3:7 24 n85, 29 n110
3:10 24 n85
3:15 19 n46
3:16 45 n9, 71 n40
3:21–2 23 n75
4:22 84 n58
4:24 62 n66
4:33–5 169 n9
6:5 67 n22
6:16 173 n32
6:24 6 n16
6:27–35 172 n30
6:39 108 n25
6:43–4 166 n41
7:11–16 43 n40
7:11–15 70 n32
7:22 186 n15
7:36–50 139 n1
7:38 149 n7
7:44 160 n7
8:4–15 49 n34
8:19–21 39 n9
8:32–3 130 n11
8:41–56 43 n40, 70 n32
9:16 77 n14, 77 n15
9:19 27 n102
9:22 199 n9
9:23 172 n30
9:26 45 n11
9:28–36 23 n74
9:56 105 n11
10:15 41 n28
10:21 47 n24
10:22 13 n4
10:27 73 n49
10:33–7 54 n13
10:40–2 142 n19
11:4 106 n13
11:15 198 n27
11:29–32 43 n36
12:1 101 n53
13:32 141 n8
13:34 148 n59
14:5 67 n20
14:27 172 n30
16:16 60 n56
19:12–27 6 n17
19:45–6 41 n31
20:13 181 n14
20:46 157 n48
21:27 38 n160
22:3–4 164 n31
22:14–20 160 n5
22:43 38 n159
22:47–8 199 n6
22:51 200 n14
22:60–2 204 n42
23:2 205 n52
23:7–12 200 n22, 207 n2
23:20 205 n53
23:33 206 n55
23:40–3 211 n28
23:42–3 23 n79
23:44–6 23 n78
23:47 23 n79
23:55–24:1 216 n1
24 186 n15
24:4–7 38 n159
24:7 217 n6
24:13–49 221 n1
24:13–32 219 n17
24:45–6 217 n6
24:47 219 n22
24:50–3 23 n77

John
1:1 3, 112 n42, 138 n46
1:2 3
1:3–5 3
1:3–4 3 n8
1:5 140 n7
1:9 49 n39, 71 n38, 140 n7
1:18 84 n54
1:19–20 19 n46
1:21 26 n95
1:23 19 n42, 24 n84
1:27 51 n50, 70 n40, 139 n52
1:29 187 n20
1:32–3 23 n75
1:47 116 n66
2:1–11 45 n8, 221 n4
2:12 91 n7

2:19–22 217 n6
3:2 215 n56
3:5–8 72 n43
3:14 155 n39
3:16 134 n27, 193 n11
3:17 105 n11, 112 n43
3:19 20 n54
3:23 138 n49
3:29 32 n122
3:34 51 n48
4:14 129 n3
4:24 46 n19, 72 n43, 85 n64
5 129 n3
5:1–9 169 n9
5:14 66 n15, 121 n4
5:22 109 n32
5:23 192 n6
5:32 214 n48
5:33 108 n30
5:35 20 n49
5:39 108 n30
6:1–13 223 n15
6:16–21 169 n9
6:29 94 n18
6:30–4 94 n18
6:35 129 n3
6:63 94 n18
7:1 140 n6
7:18 129 n3
7:20 56 n29
7:30 140 n6
7:32–44 140 n6
7:33–4 122 n8, 166 n38
7:37–8 129 n3
7:50–2 50 n42
8:12 49 n39, 129 n3, 140 n7, 156 n44
8:21 122 n8, 166 n38
8:41 137 n43
8:44 95 n23
8:48 54 n5, 54 n13, 56 n29
8:58 112 n41
8:59 140 n6
9:1–7 169 n9
9:2–3 66 n16
9:5 49 n39, 128 n45, 156 n44
9:22 215 n53
9:32 145 n37
9:34 157 n48
9:39 156 n45
10:1–16 176 n45
10:7 72 n47
10:9 72 n47
10:11 199 n9, 224 n24
10:31–9 140 n6
10:34–5 25 n91, 37 n158
10:37–8 135 n37
11 43 n40
11:1–44 169 n9
11:49–50 200 n20
11:50–2 48 n32
12 139 n1
12:27 165 n35
12:28 23 n76
12:32 205 n50
12:35–6 111 n38
12:40 21 n59
12:46 140 n7
12:47 112 n43
13:1 166 n39
13:6–10 167 n45
13:8 164 n27
13:18 194 n17
13:23–5 201 n26
13:31–17:26 199 n9
13:31–3 199 n9
13:33 122 n8, 172 n24
13:37 199 n11, 201 n27
14:8–9 110 n34
14:12 185 n14
14:19–22 221 n2
14:26 190 n34
14:27 219 n20
15:1–8 86 n71, 176 n45, 193 n9, 196 n20
15:10 174 n37
15:12 174 n37
15:13 132 n23, 166 n39
15:26 117 n70
16:7 218 n15
16:12 179 n11
16:16–22 199 n9, 218 n16, 219 n19
16:33 219 n20

17:1 188 n24
17:11 200 n19
17:21 200 n19
17:22 200 n19
18:16–27 223 n17
19:11 46 n14
19:26 92 n13
19:39–42 50 n42
20–1 186 n15
20:12–13 38 n159
20:24–9 23 n77
20:29 63 n72
20:30–1 15 n9, 225 n32
20:31 225 n33
21:15–17 34 n133
21:25 15 n9, 220 n32

Acts
1:3–4 221 n1
1:4 222 n13
1:9–11 186 n15
1:9 23 n77
1:10–11 38 n159
1:13 91 n10, 173 n32
2 101 n47
2:1–4 171 n22, 219 n22
2:1–13 186 n15
3:1–8 186 n15
3:22–3 74 n56
6:2 150 n8
7:37 74 n56
7:48 57 n35
7:51 96 n29
8:27–40 148 n56
9:36–41 186 n15
10:42 38 n160, 70 n33
16:16–18 186 n15
16:22–4 183 n3
17:23–8 16 n24
17:24 57 n35
19:11–12 186 n15
20:9–12 43 n40
23:6–8 28 n105, 142 n21
25:15–16 204 n45
28:26–7 21 n59

Romans
1:17 33 n124
1:19–20 16 n24
1:20–2 19 n39
1:23 20 n57
2–3 25 n90
2:14–15 114 n54
3:21–31 83 n53
3:29 83 n52
4:3 116 n64
4:22 116 n64
5:1–2 83 n53
5:6–7 132 n23
6:4 75 n7
7:7–25 25 n90
8:3 48 n33
8:9 15 n11
8:15–17 22 n66
8:38–9 173 n35
10:2 184 n4
10:15 11 n25
11:11 21 n60
11:23 21 n61
12:3 52 n58

1 Corinthians
1:17 53 n2
1:20 26 n97, 47 n24
1:22–4 148 n56
1:22 44 n41
1:26–7 198 n28
2:2 11 n27
2:6 11 n27
3:1–2 172 n25
5:8 101 n53
7:19 133 n26
7:20–4 113 n50
9:11–15 221 n6
9:14 221 n6
11:24 77 n14
11:24–5 160 n5
12:12–27 87 n77, 197 n26
15:10 221 n6
15:20 86 n75
15:24 38 n160

2 Corinthians
11:2 40 n25
11:23–5 183 n3

Galatians
1:19 91 n10
2:9 107 n18
2:16 83 n53
3:8–9 83 n53
3:28 20 n53
4:5–7 22 n66
5:16 75 n7

Ephesians
1:10 185 n13
1:18 13 n3, 121 n2
2:11–16 133 n26
4:15 173 n36, 197 n26
5:2 75 n7
5:22–32 40 n25
6:5–9 113 n50
6:15 11 n25

Philippians
1:21 153 n27
2:7 160 n6
2:10 69 n29
3:19 84 n55

Colossians
1:16 17 n31
1:18 86 n75, 173 n36, 197 n26
2:9 52 n58
3:11 148 n56
3:22–5 113 n50

1 Thessalonians
4:13 141 n11

2 Thessalonians
3:8 221 n6

1 Timothy
6:10 150 n10
6:15 69 n28

2 Timothy
2:14 108 n29
4:1 38 n160, 70 n33

Titus
1:16 98 n37, 98 n38

Hebrews
1:3 158 n50
2:7 16 n23
2:9 16 n23
3:1 196 n22
4:12 200 n18
5:1–13 114 n56
5:6 34 n136
5:9 86 n75
5:10 34 n136
5:12–14 172 n25
6:20 34 n136
7 34 n136
10:12 101 n51
10:22 186 n17
11:3 13 n6
11:17–19 115 n59
12:2 86 n75, 101 n51
13:4 40 n21
13 n20 129 n5

1 Peter
2:2 172 n25
4:5 38 n160, 70 n33

1 John
1:1 225 n31
2:1 171 n17
2:2 30 n114, 30 n116
2:6 75 n7
3:1–2 25 n91
3:16 132 n23

Revelation
1:7 214 n50
3:12 107 n18
17:14 69 n28
19:16 69 n28

Index of Greek and Latin Words Cited

GREEK WORDS

ἄγγελος 19 n41
αἴρων 30 n116
ἄν 55 n17, 74 n57, 110 n35
ἄνθρωπος 189 n31
ἄνωθεν 46 n14
ἀπόστολος 162 n20
τὴν ἀρχήν 112 n42
γενέσθαι 120 n80
γιγνώσκετε 169 n8
δόξα 72 n48
δοῦλοι 179 n9
ἐμφανίσω 173 n31
ἐν ἡμῖν 23 n71
ἐν τῇ χειρί 52 n60
ἔνυξε 214 n45
ἐξηγήσατο 26 n93
θηρώμενος 72 n48, 74 n55
καί 87 n78
τῶν κεδρών 198 n2
κολλυβισταί 42 n33
λόγος 15 n16, 15 n17, 15 n19, 119 n77
μεθ᾽ ὑμῶν 156 n43
παιδίον 189 n31
Paraclete 171 n17, 171 n20, 182 n19, 184 n8
παροιμία 131 n14
πάσχα 148 n61
πέμπειν 162 n20
πέτρος 35 n140
πιστεύσητε 48 n28
προβολή 17 n27
πρῶτον ὑμῖν 180 n12
σχῆμα 217 n7
τοσούτων ὄντων 222 n12
φιλανθρωπία 59 n47
φιλαργυρία 150 n10
ὁ χριστός 61 n63
Christ 34 n135
ψωμίον 164 n30

LATIN WORDS

abire in mores 115 n61
ab orbe condito 127 n38, 152 n21
abuti 15 n13
acetum 213 n39
aculeus 136 n40
ad victimam 149 n1
aenigma 55 n16
amare 223 n22
ambulare 90 n2
angelus 19 n41
aperire 214 n45
apostola 59 n48
apud 172 n23
architriclinus 39 n15
arguere 117 n71
argumentum 3 n9
ascendere 48 n29
auctoritas 68 n26
audire 127 n36
bulbus 118 n73
captare benevolentiam 45 n4
carnalis 86 n68
castellum 143 n28
casus 121 n6
Cedron 198 n2
confitens 212 n30

copia xiii, 34 n130
couti 54 n13
crassus 86 n68
cupiditas 150 n10
denuo 46 n14
descendere 87 n79
diligere 223 n22
docibilis 85 n62
dominus 55 n21, 56 n30, 128 n43, 218 n10
e supernis 46 n14, 55 n20
et 87 n78
exaudire 127 n36
familiaritas contemptum parit 62 n67
fieri 120 n80
filioli 172 n24
filius perditionis 194 n15
forsitan 55 n17, 74 n57, 110 n35
fratres 91 n7
fungus 118 n73
geminus 142 n15, 219 n25
gloria 72 n48
heus tu 128 n42
homo 15 n19
humanitas 59 n47, 61 n61
incalescere 38 n4, 40 n23
in manu 52 n60
inter nos 23 n71
invenire 35 n146
in vobis 156 n43
laterones 206 n55
legare 162 n20
legatus 129 n3
manifestabo 173 n31
messias 34 n135
metreta 39 n14
ne furorem adderet furentibus 96 n25, 148 n58
occlamantes 210 n17
oratio 15 n19, 16 n20
os 223 n18
parabola 129 n4, 131 n14
Paraclitus. *See* Greek Words, sv 'Paraclete'
parentalia 228 n8
Pascha 41 n30, 76 n8, 148 n61, 159 n1
pastor 130 n7, 131 n16
Phase 148 n61, 159 n1
prior vobis 180 n12
profitens 212 n30
prolatio 17 n27
proverbium 131 n14
puer 189 n31
renasci 45 n12, 55 n20
res ipsa declarat 60 n57, 139 n53
res ipsa loquitur 45 n5, 60 n57, 124 n24
respiciens 32 n123
salus 65 n8, 147 n54
saxum 35 n140
schola 35 n141
scrutamini 72 n45
serenare 79 n29
sermo 15 n16, 15 n17, 15 n19, 20 n50, 83 n50, 83 n51, 86 n67, 86 n70, 88 n83, 88 n85, 119 n77, 174 n37
servus 179 n9
sic 225 n30
similitudo 13 n2, 129 n2, 176 n45
sitire 55 n15
sola 57 n40, 118 n75
spiritus 46 n20
stipulatus 223 n16
ternio 226 n5, 227 n6
tollere 30 n116
transferre 76 n8
transire 70 n31, 76 n8, 159 n1
tumere 114 n51
tunica 222 n10
tyrannus 155 n35, 227 n6
ubi 46 n22
una Sabbatorum 219 n18
verbum 15 n16, 88 n85
vir 56 n27

General Index

The essential index to the *Paraphrase on John* is the text of the Gospel of John, chapter and verse numbers of which appear as running heads to the pages of the translation. In the present index, which is primarily to the notes, references to the eight running commentaries or sermon series evidently used by Erasmus as he paraphrased the Gospel, that is, Chrysostom *Hom in Joannem*, Cyril *Comm in Joannem*, Augustine *Tract in Joannem*, Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem*, the *Gloss*, Nicholas of Lyra, Hugh of St Cher, and Erasmus' own *Annotations*, have been omitted as too frequent to be usefully indexed. See the remarks on pages xiii–xv above. The details of contributions from these works to the text of the *Paraphrase* can be located by finding the passage of the *Paraphrase* that corresponds to the Gospel text in question and consulting the notes there. The index does include references to these commentaries, and to others by the same authors, where they and the *Paraphrase* do not have the same Gospel passage before their eyes.

Albert of Brandenburg, archbishop of Mainz xi, 2 n4
Alcuin 32 n120
allegorical explanation 12, 43 n37, 56 n27, 161 n17
Ambrose 15 n17
Anselm 15 n15, 15 n17
Apostles' Creed 23 n72, 38 n160, 70 n33, 101 n51, 160 n10, 188 n28, 203 n38
Aquinas, Thomas 15 n17; *Catena aurea* xiv, 25 n87, 32 n120, 40 n21, 42 n32, 209 n14
Aramaic 33 n126
archbishop of Mainz. *See* Albert of Brandenburg
Arianism 17 n29, 17 n32, 170 n11
Aristotle xiii, 15 n14, 144 n34
Augustine: *Tract in Joannem* xiii, xiii n8, xiii n9, 13 n2, 13 n3, 13 n6, 14 n7, 15 n11, 73 n51, 123 n12; various works of 15 n15, 15 n17, 96 n30, 223 n22
baptism, fire of 45 n9, 51 n49, 52 n52; symbolized 64 n5, 214 n46
Béda, Noël 3 n5, 9 n20, 10 n23, 37 n156, 39 n7, 40 n24, 49 n37, 56 n27, 57 n40, 103 n59, 105 n7, 110 n33, 118 n75, 121 n6, 170 n13, 200 n16, 201 n30, 209 n14
Bede, the Venerable 40 n21, 42 n32
Bethabara 29 n109
bishop, role of 5, 75 n6, 77 n15. *See also* clergy; Jesus, as model for clergy
bishop of Rochester. *See* Fisher, John
Budé, Guillaume 39 n14

Catena aurea. *See* Aquinas, Thomas
Catullus 122 n10
Cerinthians 11 n26, 12 n28
Charles v, emperor 4
Chrysostom: *Hom in Joannem* xiii, xiii n8, xiii n9, 13 n5,15 n17, 60 n56; various works of 37 n156, 209 n14
Cicero xiii, 15 n14, 45 n4, 108 n24, 118 n73, 156 n42

clergy: as teachers 91 n5; Jesus' instruction for 131 n16, 197 n25
Compostela 228 n9
controversies xv, xv n12. *See also* Béda, Noël; Paris faculty of theology; Spanish monks
Cyprian 15 n17
Cyril of Alexandria, *Comm in Joannem* xiii, xiii n8, xiii n9, 15 n17, 97 n31

Ebionites 11 n26
Erasmus, original works
– *Adagia* xv; (index to) 153 n29; (I i 98) 16 n20; (I ii 4) 161 n12; (I ii 6–10) 96 n25; (I ii 21) 180 n13; (I iii 4) 151 n16; (I iv 4) 105 n4, 125 n28, 202 n34; (I iv 30) 207 n1; (I iv 41) 60 n53; (I v 32) 60 n53; (I vi 32) 68 n27; (I vi 50) 16 n20; (I vi 86) 106 n12; (I viii 40) 108 n25; (II iii 20) 5 n13; (II x 94) 68 n27; (III iv 49) 45 n5; (III ix 3) 68 n27; (IV i 38) 118 n73; (IV iii 36) 46 n16, 115 n60; (IV iii 94) 57 n37; (IV viii 59) 62 n67, 90 n1
– *Annotations* xiv–xv, xv n11; 1522 edition of referred to in this volume xv; on Matthew 173 n32; on Romans 14 n8
– *Apologia adversus monachos* 57 n40, 226 n2
– *Apologia contra Stunicam* 14 n8
– *Apologia de 'In principio erat sermo'* 15 n16, 15 n17, 15 n19
– *Colloquies* xv, 40 n21, 75 n6, 104 n3, 118 n73, 166 n40, 227 n7, 228 n10
– *Declarationes ad censuras Lutetiae vulgatas* 10 n23, 37 n156, 39 n7, 57 n40, 118 n75, 121 n6
– *De conscribendis epistolis* 118 n73
– *De copia* xiii, xiii n7, 13 n2, 15 n13, 34 n130, 52 n52, 129 n4
– *De libero arbitrio* 84 n61, 209 n14
– *De pueris instituendis* 80 n37
– *Detectio praestigiarum* 86 n69
– *Divinationes* 9 n20, 37 n156, 39 n7, 49 n37, 118 n75, 121 n6, 121 n7
– *Ecclesiastes* 77 n15, 83 n50
– *Elenchus* 9 n20, 37 n156, 39 n7, 40 n24, 49 n37, 56 n27, 57 n40, 105 n7, 110 n33, 118 n75, 121 n6, 170 n13, 200 n16, 201 n30, 209 n14
– *Enchiridion* xv, 8 n19, 45 n10, 123 n17
– *Encomium matrimonii* 40 n21
– *Institutio christiani matrimonii* 40 n21
– *Institutio principis christiani* 4, 155 n35
– letters (Ep 563) 8 n19; (Ep 858) 34 n131, 226 n4, 227 n7; (Ep 894) 3 n9; (Ep 1126) 5 n14; (Ep 1219) 118 n73; (Ep 1255) 2 n2, 2 n3; (Ep 1270) 4 n10; (Ep 1274) 13 n1; (Ep 1308) xi n3; (Ep 1323) xi n3, xi n4; (Ep 1333) *see Paraphrase on John*, dedicatory letter; (Ep 1334) xiv, 10 n24, 13 n5, 15 n11; (Ep 1341A) xi n3
– *Moria* xv, 75 n6
– *Parabolae* 129 n4, 151 n16
– *Paraclesis* 34 n131, 170 n14
– *Paraphrases*: history and purpose ix, xi, xi n1, xi n2, 12, 12 n29, 13 n1, 39 n7; on Acts 40 n22; on 1 Cor 174 n39; on 1 John 3 n9; on Luke, author's preface 13 n1; on Mark ix, 148 n61; on Romans 21 n60, 25 n90, 33 n124, 148 n56
– *Paraphrase on John*: aims of translation and annotation xii–xvi; and Erasmus' annotations on John xiv–xv; and Erasmus' other works xv; author's preface 13–17, 13 n1, 46 n18; dedicatory letter xii, xiv, 2 n1, 15 n11, 77 n15; echoes of classical literature in xiii; as exposition and exegesis ix–x; Gospel text omitted in 66 n15, 87 n80, 105 n9, 115 n62, 158 n49, 208 n11; Gospel text taken out of order in 72 n46, 99 n39, 105 n5, 105 n8, 136 n39, 216 n3; history of text xi, xi n1; infelicities in Latin of 22 n63, 26 n96, 36 n153, 57 n34, 68 n25, 69 n30, 97 n35, 123 n16, 142 n22, 218 n14; scriptural allusions in xii–xiii; textual changes in. *See* textual changes in the *Paraphrase on John*; themes of ix, 2, 120 n81, 156 n18, 198 n28; To the Pious Reader 166 n40, 226 n1; use of patristic and medieval commentators in xiii–xiv
– *Ratio* xv, 39 n7, 129 n2, 226 n4

– *Responsio* 56 n27
– *Supputatio* 3 n5, 9 n20, 10 n23, 37 n156, 39 n7, 40 n24, 49n37, 56 n27, 57 n40, 103 n59, 105 n7, 110 n33, 118 n75, 121 n6, 170 n13, 200 n16, 201 n30, 209 n14
– *Virginis Matris apud Lauretum cultae liturgia* 40 n20
Erasmus, editions
– Hilary of Poitiers xiii–xiv. *See also* Erasmus, original works, letters (Ep 1334)
– New Testament xiv, 15 n16, 148 n61, 173 n32
Eucharist 3, 77 n15, 86 n69, 160 n5, 164 n30, 214 n46, 223 n15
Eusebius 75 n4
eyes of the mind, or of the heart, or of faith 13 n3, 84 n57, 121 n2, 170 n14, 226 n3

'faith alone' 57 n40, 118 n75
faith, role of in knowledge of the divine 13 n6, 47 n23
Ferdinand, archduke of Austria xii, 2 n1
Fisher, John, bishop of Rochester xi, 2 n4
flesh, meaning of 22 n68, 23 n70

Galilee, despised position of 35 n142, 102 n54
George of Trebizond xiii n9
Gloss xiv, xiv n10
God: as appellation for Jesus in New Testament 14 n8; 'highest mind' expression for 15–16
gospel: ceremonies concerning the 7–9; utility for rulers 5–11
Gospel of John: assignment of speakers of text in 25 n87, 48 n31, 49 n35, 52 n59, 54 n13; difficult to paraphrase ix, xi–xii, 2–4; disputed punctuation in passages of 3 n8, 17 n30, 17 n34, 70 n34, 87 n78, 101 n46, 138 n45, 168 n4; themes of 2, 49 n39; written to refute heresy 11–12, 12 n28, 15 n11
gradualism in revelation of Jesus as God 19 n39, 24 n81, 30 n117, 31 n119, 40 n19. *See also* Jesus, pedagogical methods of
Greek, significance of definite article in 20 n49, 35 n147, 47 n25, 78 n22, 82 n46

Hebrew idiom. *See* New Testament, Hebrew idiom in Greek
Hilary of Poitiers xiii–xiv, 10 n24, 11 n26, 13 n2, 13 n5, 13 n6, 15 n11, 15 n17, 17 n30
Holy Spirit 173 n34, 177 n1, 197 n24, 218 n15. *See also* Index of Greek Words, sv 'Paraclete'
Horace xiii, 32 n121, 68 n27, 104 n3, 148 n56
Hugh of St Cher xiv, xiv n10

Iliad 5 n15
Irenaeus 12 n28
Isidore of Seville 35 n139

Jerome 15 n17; *Chronicon* 75 n4; *Commentarii in Esaiam* 123 n14, 123 n17, 123 n18; *Commentarius in evangelium secundum Matthaeum* 173 n32; *De locis hebraicis* xiv, 35 n144, 64 n3; *De nominibus hebraicis* xiv, 33 n126, 34 n135, 35 n139, 41 n27, 41 n30, 50 n44, 135 n34, 148 n60, 148 n61, 173 n32, 198 n2, 210 n20, 212 n30
Jesus, as comforter and/or advocate 171 n17, 171 n20, 174 n38, 182 n19, 184 n8, 189 n32; divinity of 11, 14 n7, 15 n11, 92 n14; humanity of 14 n7, 15 n11, 54 n10, 92 n14, 144 n31; image of as bridegroom 32 n122, 40 n25; knowledge of secrets as proof of divinity 33 n127, 36 n152, 124 n26, 189 n29, 191 n37, 220 n27; as model for believers 118 n74, 145 n38, 207 n6; as model for clergy 34 n130, 44 n42, 53 n2, 75 n6, 77 n15, 104 n2, 160 n8; pedagogical methods of 30 n117, 44 n42, 45 n7, 55 n15, 59 n51, 68 n24, 76 n10, 80 n37, 86 n70, 144

n34, 168 n6, 192 n2; rejection of by Jews 21 n58, 62 n68, 64 n2; voluntary death of 198 n1
'Jew,' means 'confessor' 61 n62, 212 n30
Jews, Erasmus' attitude towards 8 n18; rejection of 61 n59, 120 n81
John the Evangelist, identity of xii
Josephus 75 n4
Juvenal 104 n3

LB, misprints and variants in 80 n36, 97 n32, 101 n48, 116 n67, 136 n40
Lebbaeus 173 n32
Livy xiii, 38 n4, 52 n60, 115 n61, 127 n38
Lutheranizing 9 n20, 10 n23, 40 n24, 49 n37, 57 n40, 103 n59, 118 n75

Macrobius 154 n32
Marcion 40 n21
mariology, of Erasmus 39 n7
Matthew, cardinal of Sion 2
metaphor, and figurative language in Scripture and theology 13 n2, 15–16, 46 n18, 129 n2, 176 n45
metaphors: (building) 193 n9; (hunting) 54 n11, 72 n48, 74 n55, 126 n32; (infancy) 172 n25, 184 n7; (mouthpiece) 223 n18; (seed and sowing) 43 n38, 49 n34, 60 n54, 62 n69, 86 n71; (sleep) 141 n11; (spring) 25 n87, 123 n17; (vine) 177 n1, 196 n20, 197 n24
miracles and signs, function of 39 n11, 182 n16
mystical interpretation 32 n120. *See also* typological explanation

Nemesianus 5 n14
Nepos 53 n1
New Testament: Hebrew idiom in Greek 22 n68, 52 n60, 101 n45; variant readings in Greek 48 n28, 51 n46, 104 n1. *See also* Vulgate
Nicene Creed 15 n17, 16 n21, 17 n25, 17 n29, 17 n31, 38 n160, 70 n33, 101 n51, 188 n28, 203 n38
Nicholas of Lyra xiv, xiv n10

Origen 15 n17, 46 n14, 25 n87; Latin translator of 46 n14
Ovid 228 n8; Pseudo-Ovid 115 n61

Paraclete. *See* Index of Greek Words
Paris faculty of theology 10 n23, 37 n156, 39 n7, 56 n27, 57 n40, 118 n75, 121 n6
Peter and Andrew, ages of 34 n132
Petronius 46 n16
Pharisees 95 n22
philosophy of Christ, or of the gospel 5, 7, 34 n131, 35 n141
Plato 15 n14, 16 n22, 16 n24, 107 n23, 108 n24
Plautus 118 n73
play on words 41 n30, 55 n15, 65 n8, 75 n2, 75 n7, 76 n8, 78 n23, 83 n49, 114 n54, 135 n33, 147 n54, 159 n1, 162 n20, 227 n6
Pliny xiii, 20 n57, 217 n4
Pseudo-Dionysius 13 n2, 15 n4

Quintilian xiii, 80 n37, 154 n32, 156 n42

reason, role of in knowledge of the divine 13 n5
rhetoric, devices and figures of 3, 45 n4, 52 n52, 86 n74, 127 n35, 154 n32, 156 n42. *See also* metaphor, metaphors
Rhetorica ad Herennium 53 n1
rhetorical training, of Erasmus xiii

Sabellianism 170 n11, 170 n13
Sallust 30 n112, 107 n23
Seneca 217 n4
Servius, commentator on Virgil 206 n55
Shechem 138 n49
similes. *See* metaphor, metaphors, Index of Latin Words, sv 'similitudo'
Spanish monks 57 n40, 226 n2
Suetonius xiii, 224 n25
synoptic Gospels and evangelists 11, 14–15, 14 n8; material incorporated xii–xiii. *See also* Index of Scriptural Passages Cited
Syria 91 n6
Syrian 33 n126, 123 n19, 218 n12

Tacitus 38 n4, 210 n18
Tatian 40 n21
Terence 154 n32
Tertullian 15 n17, 17 n27
textual changes in the *Paraphrase on John* (on 1:4) 17 n33; (on 1:12) 22 n64; (on 1:29) 30 n111; (on 1:42) 35 n139; (on 1:51) 36 n156; (on 3:32) 52 n55; (on 5:36) 72 n42; (on 6:32) 82 n42; (on 8:51) 118 n75; (on 9:15) 124 n23; (on 10:6) 130 n10; (on 11:54) 148 n60; (on 12:3) 149 n7; (on 14:1) 167 n1; (on 18:8) 199 n7; (on 18:11) 200 n17; (on 18:13) 200 n20; (on 18:13) 200 n21; (on 18:15) 201 n25; (on 18:19) 202 n32; (on 18:24) 203 n39; (on 19:1) 207 n3; (on 19:31) 214 n43; (on 19:42) 216 n59; (on 19:42) 216 n60; (To the Pious Reader) 226 n1
Theophylact *Enarr in Joannem* xiii, xiii n8, 15 n17, 149 n3
typological explanation 32 n120, 40 n20, 57 n38, 58 n43, 76 n9, 77 n15, 120 n81, 122 n11, 123 n20, 146 n45, 148 n60, 160 n8, 175 n43. *See also* Jesus, as model for believers; Jesus, as model for clergy

unanimity in the church 197 n25, 219 n23

Valentinians 17 n27
Valla, Lorenzo 46 n22, 107 n16, 168 n4
Varro 206 n55
Vegetius 5 n14
Velleius Paterculus 53 n1
Virgil xiii, 15 n14, 30 n112, 79 n29, 148 n56, 154 n32, 206 n55, 217 n4
Vulgate xiv–xv; 'contemporary Vulgate' defined xv
– version accommodated xv, 17 n34, 23 n71, 51 n46, 54 n8, 70 n31, 78 n20, 90 n3, 99 n39, 136 n38, 150 n13, 155 n37, 170 n13, 177 n6
– version corrected xv, 17 n30, 29 n107, 32 n123, 35 n146, 42 n34, 46 n22, 48 n28, 52 n53, 52 n60, 53 n4, 55 n17, 55 n23, 58 n46, 61 n63, 64 n3, 72 n48, 73 n50, 74 n57, 77 n15, 77 n18, 82 n46, 82 n48, 85 n62, 92 n12, 104 n62, 107 n16, 107 n17, 110 n35, 112 n42, 112 n44, 113 n45, 117 n71, 123 n21, 127 n36, 137 n42, 138 n47, 140 n3, 143 n25, 143 n28, 155 n38, 163 n22, 169 n8, 169 n10, 171 n21, 177 n7, 214 n45, 216 n2, 220 n29, 220 n30, 225 n30
– version maintained 3 n8, 24 n80, 30 n115, 45 n12, 64 n3, 64 n4, 66 n14, 67 n21, 80 n32, 84 n56, 84 n58, 96 n28, 101 n49, 113 n48, 116 n63, 123 n22, 124 n25, 131 n18, 136 n41, 145 n42, 150 n12, 152 n22, 152 n23, 167 n2, 171 n16, 171 n21, 172 n26, 177 n3, 183 n20, 187 n23, 222 n10

word, as name for second Person of Trinity 15 n16. *See also* Index of Latin Words, sv 'sermo'

Zúñiga, Diego López 14 n8
Zwingli, Ulrich 86 n69